FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 060 28 March 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Konysh, Shishlin, Levin]
U.S. Policy in Central America CC 1
Afghanistan, U.S. 'Actions' CC 3
Western Stance on Arms Talks CC 4
Tikhonov Visit to SFRY CC 6
Moscow TV's 26 March 'Studio 9' Program CC 7
[Zorin, Brutents, Bovin]
Nonaligned Conference CC 7
Western 'Reaction' to Conference CC 9
'Fundamental Problems' CC 11
Capitalist Versus Socialist Development CC 12
Future Trends and Developments CC 14
'Strategy of Neo-Colonialism' CC 17
USSR's 'Principled Position' CC 19
Gromyko Meets Perez de Cuellar on Official Visit CC 21
African Solidarity Conference Ends in Lisbon CC 21

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Andropov Interviewed on U.S. Military Policy A 1
PRAVDA Text [27 Mar] A 1
Moscow Radio Version A 3
Reaction to Interview Noted A 6
U.S. Space 'Militarization' Plans Scored A 8
[Kozyrev in PRAVDA 28 Mar]
'Extremely Dangerous Escalation' A 9
U.S. Reaction to Reagan 'Militarist' Speech Noted A 10
U.S. Economic Pressure on USSR Criticized A 11
West European Partners Concerned A 11
[Kharlanov in PRAVDA 26 Mar]
'Prospectless Policy' of 'Economic Blackmail' A 12
[Ablamov]

EASTERN EUROPE

Further Reportage on Tikhonov Visit to SFRY F 1
Planinc, Tikhonov Dinner Speeches F 1
[PRAVDA 24 Mar]

Tikhonov, Stambolic 24 Mar Speeches F 6
[PRAVDA 26 Mar]
USSR-SFRY Communique F 7
Officials Accompanying Tikhonov Listed F 9
Hungary's Marjai Arrives in Moscow for Visit [Budapest] F 9
Hungary's Kadar Receives Shalayev F 9

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Nicaraguan Delegation Makes Moscow Stopover K 1
Met by Bodyul, Komplektov K 1
Departs Moscow for Home K 1
UN Security Council Discusses Nicaragua K 1
[Vasilets]
Pentagon, CIA 'Masterminded' Nicaragua Incursion K 2
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Mar]

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD271723 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0945 GMT 27 Mar 83

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Vitaliy Ivanovich Konysh, Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin and Viktor Nikolayevich Levin; participants not further identified]

U.S. Policy in Central America

[Text] [Levin] Good day, esteemed comrade listeners. This week the events in Nicaragua and surrounding that country have been the focal point of general attention. We will begin our talk today with this. You know that several thousand Somozists, equipped and trained by specialists from the Central Intelligence Agency, the U.S. espionage and subversion organization, have invaded the territory of that country; that the storm clouds which have been gathering for a long time in this area have now burst and produced this military intervention. The situation remains very, very tense. The people and the Sandinist armed forces of Nicaragua are giving a worthy rebuff to the interventionists who have invaded. But these events illustrate yet again, illustrate, first and foremost, the policy of Washington towards Latin American countries, in general, and towards Nicaragua, a country which 4 years ago emerged on the road of genuine independence and genuine self-sufficiency.

[Shishlin] You are right, Viktor Nikolayevich. There are of course, several aspects, if you like, to these events. First of all, there is the way in which these events themselves develop. There is the destiny of the interventionists. There is the destiny of the Sandinist revolution. In its own right this intervention is unquestionably dangerous, the more so in that the second aspect, which you have already mentioned, is the fact that these events say a very great deal very clearly about the policy of the USA towards the countries of the Caribbean Basin and Central America, in particular, and about the USA's policy towards Latin America, as such. This policy is, of course, hostile towards the interests of freedom, the interests of democracy, and the interests of national independence in this region. At the present time, the United States is, as it were, again trying to turn back a page in the history of the Nicaraguan revolution. But in talking about this aspect of the events, one should not fail to speak about the third aspect, the reaction of the world to these actions, the attitude of other countries to these events. We are living in a world where events are connected and interrelated. No matter how far from us is the place where these complex, acute, and dramatic events, which require great courage from the Sandinists and from the Nicaraguan people, are taking place, we are not indifferent towards these events, in the same way that other countries are not indifferent towards them either. And this was stressed during the recent talks between Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov and Ortega, one of the prominent leaders of the Sandinist revolution. And in this respect, of course, the attitude of the Soviet Union and the attitude of the other socialist countries is absolutely unequivocal. We are on the side of the Sandinists. We are on the side of Nicaragua's independence. And we are resolutely opposed to these cynical attempts to impose one's wishes on an independent people by force and violence.

[Kobysh] This support for Nicaragua made itself felt very tangibly during the seventh conference of the nonaligned countries which took place recently in New Delhi. Virtually all states which were represented there by heads of state and government expressed support for the Nicaraguan revolution and condemned the intrigues of the U.S. imperialists. But I would like to make a few more remarks. I agree, Nikolay Valadimirovich, that one should not underestimate the dangers of the situation. The leaders of the United States are clearly saying that they will not leave revolutionary Nicaragua in peace.

The leaders of this Central American republic regard this aggression which has just been committed from Honduras as a diversionary action. This is not the main direction of the blow. They consider that this is a kind of trial of strength, so to speak, which is supposed to mislead world public opinion and the Armed Forces of Nicaragua, first and foremost. They believe that a blow from the ocean is being prepared. In other words a broad military action is being planned.

All this affair leads me to the second thing that I would like to say. One is, of course, struck by the cynicism, by the mockery, even, of everything the world community stands for. And what is the upshot? For over 40 years the United States kept its henchmen, the Somoza clan, a clan of criminals, in power in Nicaragua. When the clan began to lose its grip, they waged a war against the people of Nicaragua for several years. They more or less committed genocide there. That having also failed, they now want to overthrow the people's power by force of arms and to return their henchmen to power. Well, this is of course, a warning, a lesson, an American model, not just for Central America but for all Latin America and, actually for all developing states.

[Shishlin] Furthermore, Vitaliy Ivanovich, this is of course quite definitely related to what is taking place in El Salvador. I have in mind the actions of the United States towards El Salvador. It is also related to the U.S. support for the absolutely tyrannical regime in Guatemala, to the United States' generous support for Honduras. In other words, this is a quite broad action on the part of the Americans.

[Kobysh] And a high-handed and absolutely overt one.

[Levin] One should mention that until recently Washington did not make much of a secret of its interference in the affairs of Nicaragua. It is true that now that this incursion by the Somozaists into Nicaragua has occurred, a State Department spokesman evaded answering the question: Is the United States aiding these invasion forces? But at the same time there are direct admissions by Casey, the very same director of the CIA, in Congress, who said plainly: Yes, the rebels are organizing acts of sabotage in Nicaragua with the aid of the United States. THE NEW YORK TIMES has counted at least 150 CIA agents operating in Nicaragua. NEWSWEEK once spoke of a secret plan to train and equip a group of 500 Somozaists, for which purpose $20 million dollars is being allocated. But $20 million dollars seems rather a lot for 500, and this sum shows that the plans of the United States are very large. Besides that, here is a very curious detail: In neighboring El Salvador a question now topical is that of the replacement of the U.S. ambassador. The ambassador in this post at present intends to retire, and it is planned to replace him with the present ambassador to Honduras, Negroponte, who, according to the U.S. press, not infrequently participated directly in organizing antigovernment actions in Nicaragua. In other words, a specialist in subversive activity, a specialist in organizing international terrorism, is being transferred to the hottest spot on the border with Nicaragua. And as for this same El Salvador, you, Nikolay Vladimirovich, quite correctly mentioned its role in this chain of events.

Recently the United States granted this country huge sums of money. The Democratic Party Senator Christopher Dodd said recently that in 3 years the United States spent $748 million there, that it will soon be a billion dollars. And this senator further said: What's the point? It's all going to waste. This admission is very typical. It shows that it is impossible to halt progress.

Incidentally, concerning U.S. policy towards Latin America, it has been calculated that the United States has used force against the 10 countries of this region 81 times, 81 times! And this cynical U.S. policy has now been very clearly reflected in the events unfolding in Nicaragua. Under these conditions, the feelings of solidarity with the struggle of the Nicaraguan people voiced by Yuriy Vladmirovich Andropov in his conversation with Daniel Ortega are the feelings of the entire Soviet people, the feelings of all progressive mankind.

[Shishlin] The United States will of course have to take a good look at the international reaction to its actions in Central America and the Caribbean basin zone.

[Kobysh] If it were not for that, Nikolay Vladimirovich, they would long ago have torn apart Nicaragua, El Salvador, and other states, including Grenada, against which, as you know, conspiracies are also being woven, and attempts are being made to bar its way, so to speak, on every side.

Afghanistan, U.S. 'Actions'

[Levin] Of course the opportunities are not the same, far from being the same, and this is the decisive factor in history. This is a clear reflection of that change in the alignment of forces in the international arena which has come about under the influence of the ideas of the Great October Socialist Revolution, and this is an immutable factor. But the foreign policy course of the United States gives us no basis to conclude that it is prepared to understand the changes taking place in the world, and we may illustrate this not only by the example of Central America, but also by the example of Afghanistan, and a very clear, very convincing answer to all these intrigues is given by the Afghan people themselves. I think that the very impressive 200,000-strong protest demonstration held in Kabul near the U.S. Embassy shows very convincingly on whose side the vast majority of the Afghan people are and what the Afghan people want. Indeed, an awareness of this and an awareness of irreversable nature of the people's democratic revolution in Afghanistan is spreading literally throughout the entire world.

Again you, Vitaliy Ivanovich, mentioned the recent conference of nonaligned heads of state and government in connection with Nicaragua and the support that was extended to Nicaragua. This forum also adopted a document on Afghanistan, which by no means satisfies and, what is more, directly contradicts the aims of those aggressive forces that are banking on the kindling of counterrevolution. In this connection I would like to cite an example, which it seems to me deserves attention. Recently the correspondent of the Italian CORRIERE DELLA SERA -- a newspaper adhering to very reactionary views -- put a number of questions to Indira Gandhi, the Indian prime minister. In particular, he asked several questions about Afghanistan. Answering these questions, Indira Gandhi said that, after all, it was a matter primarily of the fact that the situation in Afghanistan is being complicated by the circumstance that the rebels are receiving up-to-date weapons from abroad. Straightaway came the question: You refer to those fighting the government of Babrak Karmal as rebels; why do you not call them patriots or partisans? Indira Gandhi replied to this in a very clear fashion that they are, nevertheless, rebels. They are rebels. And she went on directly to say that it is also necessary to look closely at what exactly the rebels are fighting against. One of the issues here is that of modernization. Can we approve of a concept, the essence of which is that women should not receive an education? After all, if one goes into the essence of the matter, many points like this crop up.

The CORRIERE DELLA SERA journalist went on to attempt to play on religious feelings, saying: Well, you see, religious feelings there, are of course, of enormous importance, and you must know that. To this Indira Gandhi replied: Yes, but many people in these religious movements are receiving assistance from abroad, and I should like to say in this connection that some of our own extremist movements too are getting assistance and encouragement from abroad. Straightaway there came the question: From whom, from the West? Indira Gandhi replied: I prefer not to speak about that, but it is quite clear that the extremists are getting assistance from the West, and incidentally, even according to official figures the United States has spent more than $200 million to support the Afghan counterrevolution -- that being just the official figure.

[Kobysh] Extremists, of course, is a very polite name for the bandits that the United States is making use of in order to overthrow people's rule, or at least to keep it constantly under strain and not give it an opportunity to solve the tasks that have been posed by the Afghan revolution. It is a war, a very real undeclared war. Washington now does not even consider it necessary to hide or conceal anything. It does not deny in any way that it is sending arms into Afghanistan. No does it deny that it is sending advisers. In short, these are direct military actions by the United States against the sovereign state of Afghanistan.

[Shishlin] As a matter of fact President Reagan has himself been receiving the ringleaders of these bands at home in Washington.

[Levin] It is therefore all the more significant that a recent plenum of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan stated that there have been clear successes both in the struggle against counterrevolution and also in the development of agriculture and industry. But these events are, of course, by no means simple ones, and as we are today paying attention above all to this adventurist U.S. policy, we cannot pass over the fact that this policy is coming more and more into collision even with United States' partners.

Western Stance on Arms Talks

[Levin continues] I do not think it would be an exaggeration to describe in that manner, in general terms, the alignment of forces which is now developing between the United States and the West European states over the question which is causing the most concern to West European public opinion: the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles on the territory of Western Europe. A meeting of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group was held last week at a little place called Vila Moura in Portugal. The defense ministers of almost all NATO states took part in this meeting, except for the French defense minister -- since France has left NATO's military organization -- and the Icelandic defense minister. The political atmosphere which formed around the Nuclear Planning Grou and the numerous articles in the West European press in which the Americans were given to understand that, in spite of everything, they would have to retreat from the policy of blocking agreement at the Geneva talks on limiting medium-range nuclear armaments were very indicative. And the British newspaper THE TIMES bluntly wrote that it would be best for the United States to demonstrate its intractability if it does not wish to lose public confidence in those countries whose agreement is needed for the deployment of the missiles. But the nuclear planning group did, of course, demonstrate precisely this intractability.

[Shishlin] But this after all is how things look. In recent weeks and months the United States and President Reagan have frequently made all kinds of official and unofficial statements about poor America, which is simply faced with the vital necessity of rearming itself. Well, all kinds of declarations are being made, the aim of which is, I would say, to put a kind of rosy complexion on this gloomy U.S. policy. This is because if we really sift through all the speeches which Reagan has made recently, all his interviews, we can see that what remains in this sieve or filter, as the case may be, are gigantic U.S. arms programs, proposals which lead the talks on limiting and reducing the arms race into an impasse, and the U.S. aspiration to get its partners in the North Atlantic bloc to adopt this most ruinous policy of escalating the arms race.

[Kobysh] What remains is the course of seeking military supremacy and hegemony.

[Shishlin] Yes. And this was very persuasively exposed in the answers given by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov to questions put by a PRAVDA correspondent. I think that our listeners have already had an opportunity to familiarize themselves with these answers. The answers contain absolutely precise and authenticated information about the actual state of affairs. But the most important thing, of course, is that these answers confirm over and over again that the Soviet Union is following the line of attaining a kind of international security which would accord with the interests of all states; of achieving the kind of solutions in which the arms race would not only not speed up but would, on the contrary, start slowing down; in which the security of every country would be in the interests of the security of all countries.

But how will things turn out in practice? How will the Geneva talks go? At present we are unfortunately obliged to say that at the moment these talks are marking time as a result of the United States unresponsive position.

[Levin] The final session of this round is scheduled to take place there on 28 March. Then there will be a recess for 2 months. But the Americans are adhering to the following tactics, as described by the journal U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT: to talks about their wish to negotiate, about flexibility, but in actual fact to change nothing.

[Kobysh] Yes. And in general one gets the impression that although the gentlemen who have come to Geneva and, in general, the U.S. State Department are displaying a certain propaganda activity, they are nevertheless working for the Pentagon. This they regard as, so to speak, their social mandate. And the aim of deploying U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe remains the main thing for them too. They have to put a bit of powder and make up on this aim, they have to create the impression that the United States was forced to do this, but the aim remains the same, and I would say that this is of course engenders a fairly disturbing, dangerous situation, which is now being projected not only into Europe.

[Shishlin] Moreover, consider if you will, what Reagan's logic is here. He says this: He has no intention, apparently, of stating that the Soviet Union is planning to wage war against the United States. Furthermore, he says precisely this: Neither do I consider war inevitable. Quite the contrary, but it is essential, he says, to clearly recognize that our security is based on our readiness to meet every threa-, of whatever kind.

We were talking at the beginning precisely about what is happening in Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Afghanistan. What guarantees are there that U.S. military might will really serve the interests of peace? There are no such guarantees. On the contrary, realpolitk convinces one that the United States increase in military power is designed to serve the aims set by the imperialist policy of the United States today.

[Kobysh] I would like to repeat that this creates a threat to all, as Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's replies to the PRAVDA correspondent's questions convincingly show. In these replies Yuriy Vladimirovich stressed that although in his speech the President was talking primarily about the Soviet Union, his speech also involved the interests of all states and peoples, and that it was necessary to realize that the American rulers were today trying to turn the European countries into nuclear hostages. The actions of Washington threaten the whole world.

[Levin] And you know, it must be said that the Western Europeans, many of the Western Europeans, understand this position, and the reaction to this speech by Reagan is a fairly clear negative one. It is true that it did not evoke raptures in the United States itself. THE WASHINGTON POST dedicated one of its editorial articles to President Reagan's address, and this article says this: The President's new idea is a purely Reaganite one, simple at first glance, complex at second glance, unnatural, and certain to cause a storm.

[Shishlin] But there are also some faily caustic comments saying that this whole concept of Reagan's, and in particular the creation of antimissile systems in space, and of such defense systems, as a whole for the United States, that all this is borrowed from some Hollywood films about the War of the Worlds, Star Wars, etc., etc. And in these caustic commentaries the thought seems to come through that all these ideas are Utopian. In particular Senator Kennedy, for example, also considers that all this is not so after all. This is not from the realm of science fiction. If some of the more remote aims outlined by Reagan can be counted as fictional and unattainable aims, the direct practical result of this speech lies in the fact that the tension in international relations, which is very dangerous already, increases even more, and constructive dialogue between the United Staes and the Soviet Union, between the socialist and the capitalist countries, will of course be held back very much indeed.

[Levin] Yes, and incidentally, in the United States itself the Democrats are voicing the view that by his plans recalling the scenario of space wars, Reagan is still trying to distract the people, distract the public from the truly acute problems, economic problems facing the United States. And it seems to me, that again Reagan's policy is coming into collision to some extent with the policy of his Western European partners. The Western Europeans understand the gravity of these economic problems, although of course things here too are far from simple. And at the meeting of heads of state and government of the EEC countries, held this week, nothing was decided. Not one question on the agenda was resolved, but it was precisely questions of economics which were discussed, questions of the struggle against unemployment, questions of currency, of the development of industry, and these questions are making themselves felt very strongly.

[Shishlin] The essence of the problems of the capitalist world lies in the fact that it endeavors to find a solution with each party concerned about his own interests. And since the problems are of a general nature it is practically impossible to resolve them by national efforts.

Tikhonov Visit to SFRY

[Levin] It can be stated plainly that the economic misfortunes, the crisis raging in the capitalist part of the world, is making itself felt in the socialist countries too. But we approach this problem from different positions, and seek a solution to the problems, a way out of the situation, which corresponds to shared interests. That is to say that we are seeking a solution to problems on the basis of coordination and on the basis of a development of cooperation between the various socialist countries. A very convincing and vivid example in this respect has been the visit to Yugoslavia this week by Nikolay Aleksandrovich Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. During the visit, a document entitled "The Basic Directions for Implementation of the Long-Term Program of Economic, Scientific, and Technological Cooperation Between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia Up to the Year 1990" was signed. We have every reason, that is to say, both the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia have every reason to be satisfied at the development of economic, scientific, and technological relations that already exist between us. Over the current 5-year period, for instance, the planned volume of deliveries will be on the order of $32 billion and now, when we are midway through the period, it is clear that, to judge by everything, this very impressive amount will be exceeded and that the volume of trade will be greater. Now, fresh ways for developing our cooperation are being uncovered, and since we are talking about this visit, we should not pass over the fact that mutual understanding exists between our countries in general on the fundamental issues of war and peace.

[Shishlin] In general one can say that, of course, we do also have issues on which our viewpoints diverge, but you are quite right, concerning what is most important and fundamental and in the field of foreign policy, the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia frequently act in conjunction and frequently act along parallel lines, or at any rate do not greatly diverge, although I repeat, there are problems on which we do have really different views. However, both in this visit and also in all the other contacts that took place at various levels between the Soviet Union and other socialist countries -- in particular, I have in mind the meeting of secretaries of central committees which took place in Moscow -- we are in reality seeking solutions that suit all our partners in cooperation. Moreover, while developing its cooperation with the socialist countries, the Soviet Union also favors fruitful and peaceful cooperation between states belonging to different social systems. We are striving for a world based on general security, for a world where good-neighborly cooperation prevails and for a tranquil and dependable world.

[Levin] That really sums up our talk today. Thank you, esteemed comrades, for your attention. All the best to you.

MOSCOW TV'S 26 MARCH 'STUDIO 9' PROGRAM

OW261251 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 0818 GMT 26 Mar 83

["Studio 9" program moderated by Prof Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet television and radio, with Prof Karen Nersesovich Brutents, deputy chief of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, and Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Bovin, political observer of IZVESTIYA]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades. We are meeting once again for our traditional monthly talk in studio 9 of the Ostankino television center. First of all, I would like to introduce the participants in our talk today, Prof Karen Nersesovich Brutents, deputy chief of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee and Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Bovin, political observer of IZVESTIYA.

Nonaligned Conference

One of the major events, not only of the past month but of recent times as well, was the conference of nonaligned states held in Delhi, the capital of India. The significance of this conference lies not only in the discussions held and the decisions adopted in Delhi, although both the discussions and the decisions of this conference were in themselves extremely important and significant, but primarily in in the fact that we are talking about one of the most influential and important political movements of the contemporary world.

Here and there and particularly in the West, a certain inertia has existed, if you will, in political thinking since former times when any event, not necessarily an important one, occurring in the West was discussed and scrutinized from every angle while events in countries which we are now accustomed to calling Third World countries often went unknown and no significance was attached to them.

Well, times have changed and the situation has changed, however the intertia of this thinking occasionally remains. At the same time, many things in today's world are occurring in those regions which were once considered to be the political wilderness, and these events and processes have a very great influence on the entire course of events in the world's political arena. From this point of view, the work of the Delhi conference is of paramount significance.

The work of the conference was covered by the mass media in an operative way and I think that the time has now come to consider it a little more deeply and analyze what occurred and to study and ponder the decisions adopted in Delhi. This is why I would like to begin our talk today by asking you, Karen Nersesovich, to express your opinion about, well, what was the primary significance of this conference?

[Brutents] Yes, really the Delhi conference was a notable international event. Its scale can best be shown with a few figures. Representatives of 100 states arrived in the Indian capital, more than half of all the states in the world, with a population of 1.5 billion. Besides, nearly all regions of the world were represented: Asia, Latin America, Africa, Oceania, Central America, and Europe -- three European states. The heads of state or government of 63 countries met in Delhi.

But the time when the Delhi conference took place is no less important. It was a responsible time from the point of view of the international situation on the one hand and from the point of view of the situation within the Nonaligned Movement itself on the other.

Now, not so long ago it was a common notion in the developing countries that the problems of peace, war, and detente were not their business, that this was the lot of developed countries and even of the superpowers exclusively.

But life and stubborn facts have refuted these notions. What was confirmed was that imperialism's course of intensifying tensions and pursuing an unbridled arms race directly affected the destiny of every nation in the world and grieviously affected the interests of the developing countries. A toughening of the policy towards the developing countries became a component part of this course. The big stick policy was once more elevated to a pedestal. The emissaries of the Pentagon and the White House are scurrying around the developing countries foisting U.S. garrisons and bases on them.

Now, as far as the Nonaligned Movement itself is concerned, the struggle about its future orientation has recently exacerbated. The movement sprang up, lived, and developed as an anti-imperialist, anticolonial, and antiracist movement. However, imperialism did not cease its attempts to turn this movement onto other tracks, using the political diversity of the movement and the existence among its members of regimes close to the imperialist powers, and as a minimum, attempted to foist on it a program of so-called equidistance [ravnoudalennost] from the socialist and imperialist states and from the Soviet Union and the United States. Besides, these attempts were particularly intensified on the eve of the Delhi conference.

This is the backdrop against which the participants in the Delhi forum met, and as a matter of fact, this is the backdrop against which its significance must be assessed, proceeding from the decisions it adopted.

[Bovin] Perhaps the complex processes which occur inside the movement itself can also be attributed to its background. The Iran-Iraq war, for instance, and certain confrontations which arise in Africa, which constantly agitate this movement and which are also used by imperialist propaganda in order to somehow undermine the meaning and the influence of this movement... [interrupted]

[Brutents] And politics, not only [words indistinct] but politics too.

[Bovin] Yes, and politics, yes. It is also a part of the background which preceded the conference in Delhi. And if we summarize this very complex background, then the fact that the conference ended successfully appears perhaps most boldly against this background. After all, it was predicted that such explosive topics as Kampuchea, Afghanistan, the Indian Ocean issue, and the Iran-Iraq war would be raised there. And in general, it was said that this conference could end with a fight between participants, and in failure. Quite a lot has been written about this. In fact, nothing like that happened. Of course, there were arguments and discussions, particularly in relations to the Cambodian [corrects himself] Kampuchean issue.

What is interesting is that if we compare the voting on Kampuchea at the UN, there 52 of the nonaligned states voted in favor of the former government. However, at the meeting of ministers of foreign affairs which preceded the conference in Delhi, only 31 states voted in support of the former Kampuchean government. In any case, Kampuchea's place remains vacant there, which in the present situation should be viewed as a plus and not as a minus.

The same thing occurred in the case of Afghanistan. No fight or sharp confrontation ensued and everybody, with different shades of opinion and approaches, everybody supported a political solution to the issue; and it is perfectly obvious that this is the general line which can be pondered over and which can be used for moving ahead.

[Brutents] As far as Kampuchea is concerned, I think that the opponents of the new regime in Kampuchea, the People's Kampuchea, had a dual setback. The fact is that last year was a year of particularly active attempts to place the legality of this government in doubt... [interrupted]

[Bovin] To promote the Sihanouk government [words indistinct] yes.

[Brutents] All that fuss about promoting Sihanouk and there was an enormous softening up, so to speak, in order to nevertheless push through the representatives of this (?regime) [Bovin makes indistinct interjection] therefore, this is not a simple repetition of the Havana decision but a repetition in new conditions which attach special importance to this decision.

[Bovin] In addition, if we talk about the results as a whole, then we should say that a principle of consensus dominated at this conference. They do not vote there and if someone is against a decision, then it is not adopted at all. Now, at previous conferences one could quite frequently see how this consensus principle was used to somehow impede or shelve a decision. Now, here this apparatus really worked to solve certain problems.

The conference adopted two documents: a political document and an economic document. The political one was compiled from quite radical positions. When compared with the political document, the economic document appears more composed. This is understandable, because political declarations are one thing, while the real economic situation is another matter. For example, the ties which nonaligned countries have with the capitalist countries.

In my opinion, the economic document is compiled more moderately and with greater restraint. It includes certain compromises and in general it is oriented towards certain real economic relations and ties, although the overall idea of revising the established economic order and changing to a new economic order is outlined entirely in this document.

[Brutents] It is expressed sufficiently clearly.

[Bovin] Yes, it is expressed sufficiently clearly. I think this can be regarded as part of the conference results.

Western 'Reaction' to Conference

[Zorin] When one studies official Washington documents and reads papers published by various U.S. scientific research centers, or simply talks to representatives of Washington's political elite, one cannot fail to note that recently, or in recent years, more correctly, Third World problems have attracted particular attention in Washington. Some time ago I had the opportunity to hear the following reasoning of a person who is quite close to the present White House. He based the need to pay close attention to the Third World on the following argument: As far as Washington's Western allies are concerned, where can they go? They are chained to the U.S. political machine and must be checked from time to time; however, in general everything here is predetermined. As far as the Soviet Union and the socialist countries are concerned their place as the opponents of the United States is also unquestionable and predetermined.

However, as far as the Third World is concerned, the countries of the Third World must be fought for, especially since both material and human resources are found there, which the United States is interested in. This reasoning is undisputably primitive and almost absurdly simplifies.... [interrupted]

[Bovin] I would not say that this reasoning is primitive, in fact it expresses a kind of strategic direction of imperialist policy... [interrupted]

[Zorin] Right... [interrupted]

[Bovin] To hold the Third World in its orbit. Now this is... [interrupted]

[Zorin] That is right. But I simply want to say...[interrupted]

[Bovin] The line.

[Zorin] ...that this extremely simplifies what in reality is considerably more complicated. Not everything is so simple in Washington's relations with its West European allies [Bovin makes an indistinct interjection of agreement] and with Japan. They are not in Washington's pocket all that much. This is what I have in mind when I say that this simplifies everything. But you are correct that this kind of reasoning -- and I repeat that this is the reasoning of a man close to the White House -- emphasizes Washington's special interest in the Third World countries.

Now, in connection with this, Karen Nersesovich, I would like -- of course you followed how Washington in particular reacted to the progress of the conference and the adopted decision -- to ask you how would you assess Washington's reaction to this event?

[Brutents] I will gladly answer your question, but permit me to add a little. Now in what Aleksandr Yevgenyevich said we have already heard a reminder that there were polemics at the conference. I would like to return to this issue so that there would not be a one-sided impression of rosiness about the conference from our talk. An idyllic situation did not prevail at the conference. There was a political struggle which was sharp at times and there were polemics. There were some addresses in which positions were advocated which are close to the positions of the imperialist powers, while the anti-imperialist level of the debates on certain issues was higher than the corresponding level in the documents which sometimes bore the imprint of [Bovin makes an indistinct interjection] inevitable compromise.

Take the well-known question of Diego Garcia: This base was brought up and its militarization condemned, but the question of who is militarizing the base and who is building runways there for B-52 bombers capable of carrying nuclear weapons is evaded. But this, of course, and I would like to emphasize this, this does not change the general picture and does not change the fact that the conference really was a large success of anti-imperialist forces and movements and of the Nonaligned Movement as a whole.

Now, about the reaction of Western foreign policy departments and Western information media, which are also in a way a measure of the conference's success. In brief, this reaction can be characterized as follows: disappointment, irritation, and even resentment. The thing is that on the eve of the conference and during the conference they did everything possible to inflame passions, made exaggerated reports about supposed dissension prevailing at the conference and predicted and inevitable split of the movement.

When none of this occurred, these unlucky prophets could not conceal their disappointment. Here, for example, is what the British FINANCIAL TIMES wrote: "The declaration prepared by the representatives of nearly 100 developing countries in Delhi undermined all of the West's hopes that the Nonaligned Movement will take a more neutral position towards the United States. The paper notes that the United States is criticized 20 times openly and 10 times obliquely in this document.

And here is the official State Department statement made public by its representative: The concluding declaration is to a great extent an unbalanced and polemical document which does not correspond with the principle of nonalignment proclaimed by the movement...[interrupted]

[Zorin] It has an imperial tone.

[Brutents] Yes, but nonetheless it gives enough information about the U.S. position and, what is even more important, about the nature of the results of the Delhi conference. The unfair attacks against the United States in the political part of the concluding declaration and the absence of criticism of the Soviet Union belittle the prestige of the declaration and reflect the continuing ability of the movement's radical elements to manipulate it. I think that it is hardly worth adding anything here.

'Fundamental Problems'

[Zorin] I think that in connection with this, it would be correct if we dwelt on the position of the developing countries in the contemporary world.

[Brutents] Well, these countries are first and foremost large figures and major problems... [interrupted]

[Bovin] Relatively speaking, there are 123 states that are included in the category of developing countries [words indistinct]...[interrupted]

[Brutents] Large scales. Yes, indeed. They include more than two-thirds of all the world's states. They have a population of 2.5 billion people. Moreover, we are talking about the most rapidly increasing population. According to forecasts, the Third World will have 90 percent of all the population growth by the year 2000, and at this point, at the end of the millenium, 7 out of 11 states with a population of more than 100 million people will be located here. A number of them are already making a fairly realistic claim to join the great powers in the next decade.

This is a zone whose role in world political and economic relations is growing noticeably, and this was one of the most important facts of international life in the last decade. Moreover, it should be said that this is linked with many factors, both political and economic. Well, I will begin with a generally-known factor, that enormous raw material wealth is concealed below the ground in this zone, which has not been entirely surveyed yet. At the beginning of this decade 90 percent of the oil reserves outside the socialist world, almost 72 percent of the gas, 79 percent of the cobalt, more than 70 percent of the tin, bauxite, and so forth were found here. This list could be continued ad infinitum.

[Bovin] I would like to note that forecasts of, say, 10 or 15 years ago said that a scientific and technical revolution and an age of synthetics was underway, that the significance of natural raw materials will decrease, and that the economic significance of the Third World will decrease. However, nothing of the sort happened. Of course, synthetics increased, but consumption of natural raw materials continues to grow. Therefore, all the more...[interrupted]

[Brutents] Their value -- I do not mean prices -- but their value is also growing although, of course, there is a kind of fluctuation here; there are ups and downs.

[Bovin] By their supply and demand on the market.

[Brutents] Yes, yes, of course. However, the economic significance of this region is not restricted by this. Last year -- this is an interesting figure -- in 1982, 40 percent of U.S. exports and 28 percent of exports of the 24 developed capitalist OECD member-states went to these countries. A few weeks ago BUSINESS WEEK wrote that the markets of these countries, that is the export potential, served as the main motive force for the world capitalist economy in 1981-82. Moreover...[interrupted]

[Bovin] Yes, it is a very promising market.

[Brutents] Yes, it is a rapidly growing market because the figures I cited are five times greater than those at the beginning of the 70's. Moreover, it is well-known that it is a source of enormous profits for multinational corporations and -- also a new phenomenon -- it is a supplier of a certain group of simple manufactured goods to Western countries -- and not only to Western countries. This is the economic significance of these countries.

Here of course by way of (?sharp) contrast, it should be said that at the same time they are countries with enormous poverty, backwardness, and illiteracy, behind which lie human suffering and torment... [Bovin interrupts with an indistinct interjection]

[Bovin] One figure alone can be cited. According to calculations it is considered that among these 2.5 billion almost 1 billion live in absolute poverty -- in absolute poverty. Now what does this mean? Well, last year 50 million people died of hunger in these countries -- 50 million, of whom 15 million were children. This is what it means in practice. What about the unemployed? There are tens of millions of unemployed people in the Third World and if we talk about those who are not fully employed, there are 300 million people not fully employed in production. And chronic diseases... [interrupted]

[Brutents] Some 1.2 billion people receive no professional medical assistance whatsoever; 250 million children do not attend school. One can remember the photographs circulated in many journals. These showed children in the Western Sahara region of (Sahelg), they were walking skeletons. Well, I repeat that there are many statistics, but like all statistics they are impassive. However, behind them are real and human problems, I would even say that behind them lies one of the general, fundamental problems of contemporary world development.

[Bovin] Moreover, the danger here lies in the fact that this enormous rift between the developed and developing countries has not diminished in recent years... [interrupted]

[Brutents] It is growing.

[Bovin] It continues to grow because on the one hand the rate of economic development has slowed down and on the other hand you have this population explosion that continually consumes what they manage to produce, and the rift continually increases. Generally, this is fraught with very unpleasant consequences.

[Brutents] It should also be said that this is a zone of profound and continuing opposition to imperialism which left terrible colonial scars and which even now continues to regard and approach this region as an object of its political domination and monopoly exploitation.

Capitalist Versus Socialist Development

Finally, I would also like to say that this region is of course one in which very serious socioeconomic and social changes are taking place. There is a transition occurring in the region from precapitalist attitudes -- at times even prefeudal attitudes -- to new forms of social life, either along the path of socialist orientation or along the path of capitalism, and the path is being decided in increasingly acute social and class conflicts in which imperialism strives to actively interfere... [interrupted]

[Bovin] I feel that precisely this diversity is one of the fundamental characteristics of the Third World as it is sometimes called. The diversity is not uniform but is generally economic. If we say that if the rift between developed industrial countries and these countries is growing, then the economic diversity within the developing countries is now also growing.

Say we take the group ...[Bovin pauses] the average income, the national gross per capita income, for all these countries is considered to be somewhere in the order of U.S. $650-700; in the group of least developed countries -- there are 40 or so of them, about 41 -- this income is approximately U.S. $170-180. You can see the big difference, and incidentally in the last 10 years this difference has doubled. So, another rift is appearing which generally also has a large number of negative social consequences.

Of course, if we talk about the main division, the watershed passing through the Third World, this if of course the choice of a path -- a path of capitalist development or a path of socialist development, socialist orientation. Now the effect of this is not uniform. Let us say that a capitalist path of development has been chosen. However, in the framework of this general self-determination one can see very great differences. For instance let us take the group of oil producing countries like Saudi Arabia or Iran: this group of states has accumulated enormous financial resources. You know that in 1980, for the first time in history -- I think their revenue was U.S. $300 billion -- for the first time in history there was a redistribution of profits generated in the capitalist countries in favor of this group of states. This was a completely new development. However that might be ... [interrupted]

[Brutents] This incidentally did not hinder the oil monopolies from making their own profits.

[Bovin] Yes, of course, of course, but the fact is that these enormous financial resources allow this modernization to be conducted from the top.

One can take another group of countries -- for instance, Singapore, Hong Kong, and perhaps South Korea -- countries that are following a capitalist path. A fairly developed processing industry is characteristic of them. They and their goods now figure actively in capitalist countries. The multinational corporations operating there are actively developing even modern ... [Bovin pauses] electronics, for instance, using the cheap work force that exists there.

One can take another group of countries where bureaucratic capital serves as a support for capitalist development. For instance it includes Indonesia and Pakistan where there is an authoritarian regime of a military type plus this utilization of bureaucratic capital ... [interrupted]

[Brutents] Another line of this watershed goes as follows: Those countries that attempt to combine capitalist development with consolidation of their independence and with the cultivation of a national, a nationally independent capitalism ... [interrupted]

[Bovin] Like India.

[Brutents] Yes. And countries where general control over development and, correspondingly, its forms, are in fact determined by multinational corporations. This is the kind of development which is frequently called dependent capitalism in literature. This is an extremely important graduation both for the social structure and for the distribution of social forces as well as for the political positions of these states and their foreign policy positions.

Secondly, the fact that you mentioned Singapore -- and Taiwan is sometimes mentioned -- and South Korea, these are the so-called new industrial countries around which a very extensive advertising campaign has been initiated. They really have attained tangible economic successes.

However, in recent years their model of economic development, the so-called export model of industrialization -- that is industrialization, to the extent that this process can be called industrialization, which is oriented toward an external market, the market of the imperialist states; and is not tied up with the domestic market, and thus has its ensuing consequences -- has begun to founder. Presently this economic miracle [Bovin makes indistinct interjection] is revealing all its flaws and, in my opinion, this of course is also a significant fact in these countries' general search for a path of development.

I must say that generally, even in a broader sense, this point determines the complex nature of this development. The fact that contemporary forms of technical, economic, political, and social development have existed for a long time alongside each other and have become interwoven with traditional forms as if the modern system of development is being superimposed over traditional forms. Now for example, when you see an advertisement with a Mobil oil gas station alongside an African tribal village, this is not simply an exotic picture, it is a reflection of this interweaving and this correlation which determines on its part the fairly tortuous course of events.

[Zorin] In connection with what you, my collegues, are saying I would like to ask the following question: You have mentioned those countries which have so far chosen a capitalist path of development. Before that we spoke about the Delhi conference and the fact that this conference obviously leaned in an anti-imperialist direction which aroused displeasure, particularly in Washington. So this means that the political climate in the developing countries is not being formed by these countries which are viewed by, say, Washington as its periphery and as its reserves?

[Brutents] (?You want to) return the talk to what I have spoken about. I spoke of the existence of an extremely important watershed among the countries which are presently following a capitalist path. Among them are countries that primarily want to combine capitalist development... [interrupted]

[Bovin] With independence.

[Brutents] with national independence and to strengthen national independence on this path. These countries... [interrupted]

[Zorin] I asked this question specifically to emphasize this.

[Brutents] I understand; you provoked me, so to speak. So naturally their development along an independent path together with economic progress is increasingly pushing them up against the imperialist world which does not want to reckon with their political independence and which is even less prepared to reconcile itself with their economic self-reliance.

But this of course does not change the fact that we must speak out for the socialist-oriented countries that hold the most consistent anti-imperialist position and that, in this sense, come out as a vanguard force of the developing countries. And I must say that despite the fact that they are in the minority when compared to the countries in which capitalist attitudes are presently expanding, they are exerting a far greater influence with their line than could be judged from their numbers.

Future Trends and Developments

[Zorin] We have spoken of the situation today. It seems that it would be expedient now to try to imagine how processes will develop in the Third World countries in the future, maybe not in the distant future but at least in the forthcoming period.

[Bovin] Well, you know Valentin Sergeyevich, this is a fairly complicated question, and unfortunately... [interrupted]

[Zorin] [Words indistinct] Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, it is more difficult to speak about the future than about today.

[Bovin] No I understand, but unfortunately I do not have a very optimistic view of the future, at least not for the coming decade or two. Judging from what is happening in the world today I can sufficiently predict, for example, crisis-prone lines of development and the possibility of new local military conflicts within the framework of the Third World. A very simple thing points to this. In the past... [Bovin pauses] since 1965 the share of these governments, of the developing countries, in the total sum spent on arms has increased by two and a half times. Presently, the developing countries account for 38 percent of all conventional arms purchases. So generally the arms race envelops these countries as well. Now if you add to this the contradictions which exist, the enormous difficulties in the nationalities question, various religious disputes, territorial controversies left behind by colonialism, and new problems that will arise -- problems related to authoritarian regimes in many of these countries -- in my opinion a fairly accurate prediction can be made that the future development of these countries will be linked both with armed conflicts and with all kinds of contradictions, including various coups and internal instability. These are some of the things we can talk about.

However, if we formulate the question a little more broadly, then it seems to me that the main trend which will be seen there will be an increasing polarization of these countries. On the one hand certain socialist-oriented countries will become more clearly defined, will draw increasingly closer to the countries of the socialist world, and gradually pull out of the capitalist world economy while on the other hand, capitalism in these countries will become consolidated in two versions. For instance in one version they will form alliances with the imperialist countries while in the other they will form a new sphere of independent states with some type of fixed capitalism. In this way, one can consider this issue in the most general of terms. There will be very many difficulties, but the main thing is that if this break between what is now sometimes called the North and South grows, then certain global dangers will arise.

[Brutents] If we simply extrapolate certain difficulties and complications which exist the picture will be approximately like [Bovin makes indistinct interjection] like Aleksandr Yevgenyevich protrayed it. However, the thing is that historic development is wonderful in that it conceals many surprises. That is the first thing.

[Bovin] That is true.

[Brutents] And second, there are other trends as well which do not give us reasons to be boundlessly delighted or optimistic, but nevertheless allow us to look into the future with a certain cheerfulness.

Now, if we glance back to recent years or even further to the 70's, we will see among all the vividness of events -- and there was vividness; there were ebbs and floods, and unexpected turns, and there were changes, acute situations, political breakups, and coups about which Aleksandr Yevgenyevich spoke and there were other things in this torrent of stormy events -- a certain scum and foam coming to the surface together with all kinds of obscurantist currents and ideas; nevertheless, through all this one can still see a certain trend of basic development.

It seems to me that this trend is primarily one of strengthening the independence of these states; of increasing the consolidation of sovereignty, not only in the political sphere, but also soverengty over their natural wealth; and a gradual strengthening of the determination to make independent economic decisions and define their own economic policy.

Furthermore, we have already spoken of the fact that these countries were not bypassed by economic progress and we quoted corresponding figures. I can cite another: During the past decade the annual percentage of growth of the gross national product of these countries was nearly double that of the developed capitalist states. It is another matter that this is an uneven thing, as we have already said, and it is another matter that thus far it is in no way coordinated or matched by population growth. But I must say, Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, that demographic processes there, judging from all predictions and studies, have passed their peak. A decrease has begun... [interrupted]

[Zorin] Besides this, what was laid down economically has not yet yielded all.... [interrupted]

[Brutents] yes, yes.

[Zorin] Its results... [interrupted]

[Brutents] Asolutely correct, absolutely right.

[Zorin] It was laid down for the future.

[Brutents] We also cannot exclude certain more positive international conditions for their development. This is by no means impossible. I repeat: I do not want to engage in exaggerated optimism here, but this is simply an unavoidable commentary to that sombre tone which you have already created with your previous remarks.

[Bovin] Yes, I by no means wanted to deny the possibility of progress.... [interrupted]

[Brutents] Excellent.

[Bovin] I simply wanted to say that it occasionally adopts agonizing and bloody forms.... [interrupted]

[Brutents] Quite right, quite right.

[Bovin] That is what I wanted to say.

[Brutents] But here I will say that as far as difficulties are concerned, well, we do not have to be surprised or even express impatience. After all, it is an enormous process; enormous by the depth of the changes, by the scale of the tasks, and finally by the numbers of people involved. We are talking about hundreds of millions if not billions of people.

We are talking about difficulties, but we should remember the social and political convulsions through which Europe had to pass when it moved from the Middle Ages into a new era. Here, I could recall Lenin's words from his work "The Historic Fortunes of the Teaching of Karl Marx" -- which became a classic -- in which he said that courage should be drawn from the fact that 700 million strong Asia, as he wrote, has become involved in the struggle for the very same European ideals.

'Strategy of Neo-Colonialism'

[Zorin] We have mainly spoken about the developing countries' difficultues stemming from their internal, if I may put it that way, conditions -- conditions which exist within the Third World itself. Apparently, a definite and major role is also played by outside circumstances and many difficulties for the developing countries are created by imperialism. Now, I would like to ask you, Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, to say a little about this.

[Bovin] Well, there is a concept known as neocolonialism. The fact is, say, that -- well let us take the colonial period again. On what was the exploitation of these countries based? On a noneconomic force? They were simply colonies. They were conquered and everything possible was pumped out of them.

This period has passed. This method of exploitation has become a thing of the past and even the Americans as well as the British and the French understand that nothing can be gained here now. And it is exactly...[Bovin pauses] although generally noneconomic methods remain. Take the Americans for instance. Take their strategic zones. They mean that the Americans are orienting themselves toward direct military and political interference.

Presently, however, this is not the most important thing. In my opinion, the main thing in the strategy of neocolonialism is the use primarily of economic levers and methods for solving two tasks. The first task of this stragegy is to hold the developing countries within the framework of the capitalist world economy. The second task of neocolonialism lies in promoting the development of capitalist economic attitudes in these countries. In other words, we must not comprehend this in such a primitive way as if, say, the former colonial powers want to keep these countries at their current low level.

On the contrary, they are not satisfied with this low level. It is far more profitable for them if there is a skilled workforce and a large market there. And with this policy of theirs, they are trying to establish this -- however invariably -- on the basis of capitalist economic relations.

This is the general strategic line of neocolonialism which is expressed concretely in two directions: Through the state line or what it known as state aid. These are gratuitous subsidies and credits on preferential terms. Besides, this aid naturally has a sufficiently single-minded character. The stabilization of a regime which, say, is pro-imperialist in nature. Some kind of political payment is received for this. For example, Egypt signed the Camp David accord and the Americans immediately increased their state aid. Take Oman or Somalia. Certain support bases were needed there so the same thing occurred: state aid was immediately increased. However, as I see it, this is not the major thing in the strategy of neocolonialism at present.

[Brutents] Overall state aid is now being noticeably reduced... [interrupted]

[Bovin] Yes.

[Brutents] Like the sum total of assistance generally, while private capital investment has come to the fore both in scale and purposefulness. [words indistinct]

[Bovin] Yes, and today, these same multinational corporations are the major promoters of this neocolonialism strategy. Of course, this too should not be understood primitively.

The multinational companies promote the development of capitalism in these countries or in other words, they promote a general economic upsurge. This is quite obvious. But what price do these countries pay for this upsurge? This is the question which needs to be asked.

Now in fact the profit standards in these countries are on the average about twice as high as in the developed capitalist countries. This is why they flock here like flies to honey. But what happens after all, if one tallies all the countries and the direct investments made by the multinational corporations and compares this with the outflow of financial resources from these countries in the form of profits and dividends, then what leaves them is larger than what is invested. Take the American multinational corporations. Statistics show that for every invested dollar they get about $4.50. In other words capitalism is -- in reality -- financing its own development at the expense of this robbery... [interrupted]

[Zorin] Of course the multinational corporations are not philanthropists.

[Bovin] Naturally they are not philanthropists.

[Zorin] They are doing this precisely because of the profits they can make there.

[Bovin] The second point is also characteristic. After all, they practically take control of, say, the main branches of foreign trade. Now let us consider a completely obvious thing. Take the cocoa or coffee which these countries sell. They receive about 14-15 percent of the final price at which these products are sold. The remainder goes to these same... [interrupted]

[Zorin] They receive considerably more.

[Bovin] Yes, and even more. I simply cited two situations. A lot can be said about this and so on and so forth. A really contradictory picture takes shape. On the one hand they really promote economic growth, but the cost is extremely high. And by the way, that rift which is increasing within the Third World itself is also widening at the expense of the multinational corporations because they orient themselves towards certain countries and pull them up while others sink lower and lower. This is roughly what can be said about this.

[Brutents] I would like to add a comment if I may. I simply want to object to a term. You said it promoted their general economic upsurge. The thing is that it is not entirely general if we take it as a whole... [interrupted]

[Bovin] [words indistinct] I understand [words indistinct] it is the main one.... [interrupted]

[Brutents] It is very specific; it is a very specific form of economic upsurge. You spoke here about a motley picture and an unevenness in development. We spoke about this from an outside point of view taking the situation in certain developing countries in relation to others. However, there is an irregularity in the development within the developing countries themselves and it is related to the activities of these multinational corporations.

Capitalist development slices both the economy and society of these countries into two unequal parts. The smaller part is in the modern sector, so to speak, and the other, which remains beyond the realm of development, is in the traditional sector. Besides... [interrupted]

[Bovin] Besides, the modern sector corrupts this traditional sector.

[Brutents] Yes, yes. Now, at the same time, capitalism carries out its normal work. It exacerbates social contrasts by concentrating the wealth at one pole and poverty at the other. Besides, this rift between the top and the masses of working people which is generally characteristic of capitalism is even greater in many developing countries than in the developed capitalist countries.

[Bovin] This is natural. I would like to add another thought regarding the result of all of this, this aid, these multinational corporations and so forth. Now in 1973 the overall debt of these countries was equal to $97 billion, while in 1983 it will be on the order of about $600 billion, I think, plus or minus something.... [interrupted]

[Brutents] You can cite various figures.

[Bovin] Yes. Six hundred billion dollars -- a colossal sum which is that burden, that weight which hangs... [interrupted]

[Zorin] The debt to (?the imperialist countries).

[Bovin] Yes, yes.

[Brutents] Add to this another figure: $84 billion. These are the annual payments, interests, debt repayments, and so on of the developing countries... [Bovin makes an indistinct interjection] This is a real financial noose... [interrupted]

[Bovin] Yes. This is the result of the relationship between this model of development and this aid.

USSR's 'Principled Position'

[Zorin] Well, we have talked about the position, about the difficulties created by the imperialists for the developing countries. In our program's conclusion I would like us to at least briefly dwell on the principled position of the Soviet Union. Now, the general aspect of the Soviet Union's position is, I think, familiar to our television viewers. However, I would like to somehow concretely define this position and briefly discuss its major component parts.

[Brutents] Well, I would say here that we have an excellent work record. Regardless of which phase or which period of the national liberation movement we take, we can declare everywhere that our party and our state have pursued a powerful and persistent line determined and bequeathed by Lenin. This is a line of support for the struggle of these people. The Soviet Union... [interrupted]

[Bovin] This is more than our foreign policy; this is our philosophy, if you will.

[Brutents] Yes, quite right. The Soviet Union, by its revolutionizing example in emancipating the oppressed nations of our country, by its active solidarity with the struggle of these people, and finally because of the fact that during the postwar years we essentially fettered the punitive military machine of imperialism, has, if I can express it that way, come out as the midwife of the collapse of the colonial system.

With the emergence of independent states, we immediately established relations of a new type unprecedented for them based on the principles of equality, respect for sovereignty, noninterference in internal affairs, and mutually advantageous cooperation. At the same time these relations were kind of laboratory, you could say, in which they accumulated and mastered the skills of equal relations which they then strove to extend to their international ties in general.

It is indisputable that the Soviet Union and the socialist states as a whole have come out as a factor which made it easier -- if it did not stipulate the very possibility -- for the developing countries' active intrusion into world politics, and which increased their international prestige. Our party welcomed this process, as was noted at the 25th congress, as an absolutely natural, just, and irreversible one. This is our position which is directly opposed to the imperialist position which meets this process with hostility.

I think it is also worth mentioning that we rejected and reject the approach which is particularly characteristic of the present U.S. Administration, an approach to these countries as some kind of arena of struggle between the socialist and imperialist states. Now I think that it was the sum of all this that served as the basis of a very rapid and active expansion of our relations with these countries. We now have diplomatic relations with about three times as many developing states as compared to the beginning of the 60's.

I think that the economic side of this matter deserves special attention, particularly insofar as this is currently the favorite field for dishonorable anti-Soviet intrigues on the part of the imperialist powers. Recently, imperialist politicians and occasionally the leaders of the imperialist powers as well have turned to us with appeals to join in their efforts to solve the North-South problem. Of course, these appeals are hypocritical through and through and are purely speculative. Their genuine aim is to divert attention from their own position on this question, from the continuing exploitation of the developing countries by imperialist monopolies. In other words, this is an attempt to bring the developing countries into collision with us.

At the same time, the situation is sufficiently clear. It is ludicrous to address appeals on this topic to us. The Soviet Union has never been and is not now in any way indifferent to the economic problems of the developing countries. On the contrary, we actively supported and support their lawful desire to establish equal economic relations, to rid themselves of the chains of economic dependence on the imperialist powers -- a desire which was embodied in the program for a new international economic order. Is it necessary... [interrupted]

[Bovin] By the way, the principles formulated in it are in many ways the principles which we introduced to international economic relations.

[Brutents] Furthermore, I do not know if it is necessary to recall that the Soviet Union was a pioneer of equal economic cooperation with these countries and that we were at the foundation of the establishment of key branches of industry in these countries. Corresponding figures and facts could be cited, but they are widely known.

It is another matter that we are not prepared nor do we plan to share with the imperialist powers the responsibility for the colonial plunder and its grave consequences, for the continuing exploitation of this zone of the world, or for the fact that the imperialist monopolies are in a certain sense presently exporting crisis manifestations to these countries and intensifying their pressure on them in order to absorb -- in this way -- the shock of the economic crisis which enveloped the capitalist world with their help.

In conclusion, a realistic analysis such as this confirms in my opinion quite definitely that at the present stage broad opportunities also exist for further strengthening cooperation between the Soviet Union and the developing countries. Its prerequisites lie in the common interest toward opposing and neutralizing imperialist, aggressive, neocolonialist policies, policies directed against peace and detente and against the freedom and independence of people.

If we talk about our party and our state, then, as Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed at the November plenum of the Central Committee, solidarity with the states that have liberated themselves from colonial oppression and with people defending their independence was and remains one of the fundamental principles of Soviet foreign policy.

[Zorin] Well, thank you. Our time on the air has run out. I would like to thank you for taking part in our program and our television viewers for their attention. And so, until we meet again here in our Studio 9, thank you.

GROMYKO MEETS PEREZ DE CUELLAR ON OFFICIAL VISIT

LD271502 Moscow TASS in English 1459 GMT 27 Mar 83

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS -- United Nations Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar arrived in Moscow today for an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

The guest was welcomed at the airport by member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Foreign Minister of the USSR Andrey Gromyko, and other officials.

AFRICAN SOLIDARITY CONFERENCE ENDS IN LISBON

LD280533 Moscow TASS in English 0509 GMT 28 Mar 83

[Text] Lisbon March 28 TASS -- The international conference of solidarity with the frontline states, for national liberation and peace in the South of Africa has ended here today. For three days delegates from about 70 countries, representatives of national and international organizations discussed the real situation in the south of the African Continent and adopted a broad program of actions in support for the struggle of the frontline states of Africa for freedom, independence and sovereignty.

The documents adopted at the conference especially stress that the very existence of apartheid and the illegal occupation of Namibia by racist Pretoria pose a serious threat to African peoples.

ANDROPOV INTERVIEWED ON U.S. MILITARY POLICY

PRAVDA Text

LD261516 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 83 First Edition p 1

["Yu.V. Andropov Answer to a PRAVDA Correspondent's Questions" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Question: On March 23 President Reagan made a wordy statement on issues of U.S. military policy. How do you evaluate this statement?

Answer: Quite a spate of speeches devoted to one and the same topic -- military preparations, military programs, and the development of new types of weapons -- has been coming out of Washington of late. This is what the President spoke of that time, too.

The mentioned speech of the President was apparently conceived in order to try and influence the frame of mind in the United States, to calm down the growing alarm there at the bellicose course of the administration. Of course, it is up to the Americans how they will evaluate the President's address.

However, what the President spoke of concerns not only the Americans. For the whole message of the speech is that America should intensively arm itself and become the world's dominating military power. At the same time in a bid to justify these hegemonistic claims such impudent distortions of the Soviet Union's policy are made, such questionable strategems are used, that, frandly speaking, the question promotes itself -- what is the President's idea of the standards of conducting relations with other states?

Hear the president and it would seem that the United States is weaker than the Soviet Union here, there and even in its immediate neighborhood. And all this because over the past two decades the USSR has been rapidly building up its Armed Forces, while the United States, allegedly, has been sitting with arms folded, as its armed forces declined.

True, the Soviet Union did strengthen its defense capability. Faced with a feverish U.S. effort to establish military bases near the Soviet territory, to develop ever new types of nuclear and other weapons, the USSR was compelled to do so in order to eliminate the U.S. military superiority for which Washington is now pining so much. The military-strategic parity attained has deprived the United States of a possibility to blackmail us with the nuclear threat. This parity is a reliable guarantee of peace, and we will do everything to preserve it.

As to the allegations that the United States has done nothing in the past two decades, only naive people can believe that. For confirmation let us turn to some important facts.

It is known that a qualitative breakthrough was achieved in the U.S. strategic forces preciesly during that period. Suffice it to say that the United States installed multiple warheads on its ballistic missiles. And it did so, despite our repeated calls to penounce the move in order to avoid a new spiral of the race in missile weapons. If the President had taken the trouble of looking into the briefs on the talks he would have seen for himself that it was really so.

What happened as a result will convincingly be seen from the example that after such re-equipment each missile based on a U.S. submarine acquired the capability of hitting 14 targets at a time. And every submarine carries 16 such missiles. Their total yield is equivalent to that of almost 500 nuclear bombs similar to the one dropped on Hiroshima.

On the whole, in the period of ostensible inactivity of the USA, which the President is talking about, the number of nuclear warheads on U.S. strategic armaments grew from four to ten-odd thousand.

Can an increase in nuclear arsenal by a factor of 2.5 be referred to as inactivity? No, it cannot be called so in any way.

And now about Europe where, according to the head of the White House, the position of the USA and of NATO in general is rather hard. And if one again turns to facts, one can easily see that the aggregate number of U.S. nuclear munitions there has trebled over the period and is now more than seven thousand units. Is it also a result of inactivity or what?

The President pretends that almost a thousand medium-range nuclear systems of the USA and its NATO allies do not ostensibly exist in the zone of Europe, and that it is unknown to him that by an aggregate amount of nuclear warheads on those systems NATO has a 1.5-1 advantage over the USSR.

The President not only keeps silent about all that. He tells a deliberate untruth [on govorit zavedomuyu nepravdu] [Moscow TASS English at 1511 GMT on 26 March carries a version of the Andropov interview with PRAVDA and here reads: ...a deliberate lie...], asserting that the Soviet Union does not observe its own unilateral moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles.

He also passes it over in silence that U.S. medium-range armaments are not just anywhere but are literally at our threshold. Meanwhile, from this point of view, to us there is no difference between them and strategic weapons stationed in U.S. territory, and this concerns not only Europe. Many hundreds of U.S. delivery are stationed along the entire perimeter of the USSR, and, according to officially announced plans of the Pentagon, their number is to grow many times over. More than 12,000 long-range cruise missiles alone are to be deployed.

The President demonstrated a photograph showing a civil airport in a Latin American country, and managed to portray it is a threat to the USA. But he did not show photographs showing hundreds of runways thousands of miles away from the United States, runways on which U.S. aircraft with nuclear weapons on board are stationed ready to take off at any moment.

And all this, it turns out, is not enough to the present U.S. Administration. Trillions of dollars are being sought in order to have still more land-, sea-, air-, and space-based weapons. It is planned to sharply build up all types of nuclear armaments. The President has also announced large-scale measures to create qualitatively new systems of conventional weapons. Thereby another direction in the arms race is opening up.

However much the importune talk that all this is being done in reply to a "Soviet military threat" is repeated, it should not delude anyone. Everything that the Soviet Union did and does is no evidence of its seeking military superiority. Treaties and agreements to which we went and are ready to go with the U.S. side are aimed at lowering the level of confrontation without upsetting parity, i.e. without detriment to the security of both the USSR and the USA.

And it does not become those who derailed the SALT-II treaty, which clearly recorded precisely this goal, to try to pose as peace makers now again. While rejecting our proposals which suggest that the Soviet Union and NATO have in Europe an equal number of missiles, an equal number of aircraft, or that there be no nuclear weapons that it all, neither medium-range nor tactical ones, they still speak of the USSR's striving for superiority. The strategems which the present Washington leaders resort to in order to denigrate the USSR's policy are inadmissible in relations between states.

Question: President Reagan declared that he had devised a new, defensive conception. What does it boil down to in practice?

Answer: This is something that needs a special mention.

After discoursing to his heart's content on a Soviet military threat, President Reagan said that it was time a different approach was adopted to ensuring U.S. strategic interests and announced in this connection the commencement of development of large-scale and highly effective antiballistic missile defenses.

On the face of it, laymen may find it even attractive as the President speaks about what seem to be defensive measures. But this may seem to be so only on the face of it and only to those, who are not conversant with these matters. In fact the strategic offensive forces of the United States will continue to be developed and upgraded at full tilt and along quite a definite line at that, namely that of acquiring a first nuclear strike capability. Under these conditions the intention to secure itself the possibility of destroying with the help of the AMB defenses the corresponding strategic systems of the other side, that is of rendering it unable of dealing a retaliatory strike, is a bid to disarm the Soviet Union in the face of the U.S. nuclear threat. One must see this clearly in order to appraise correctly the true purport of this "new conception".

When the USSR and the USA began discussing the problem of strategic arms, they agreed that there is an inseverable interconnection between strategic offensive and defensive weapons. And it was not by chance that the treaty on limiting strategic offensive arms was signed simultaneously between our countries in 1972.

In other words, the sides recognised the fact, and recorded this in the above documents, that it is only mutual restraint in the field of AMB defenses that will allow progress in limiting and reducing offensive weapons, that is in checking and reversing the strategic arms race as a whole. Today, however, the United States intends to sever this interconnection. Should this conception be converted into reality, this would actually open the floodgates of a runaway race of all types of strategic arms, both offensive and defensive. Such is the real purport, the seamy side, so to say, of Washington's "defensive conception".

Question: What general conclusion should be drawn from the U.S. President's speech?

Answer: My answer will be short and unambiguous: The incumbent U.S. Administration continues to treat an extremely perilous path. The issues of war and peace must not be treated so flippantly. All attempts at achieving military superiority over the USSR are futile. The Soviet Union will never allow them to succeed. It will never be caught defenceless by any threat. Let there be no mistake about this in Washington. It is time they stopped devising one option after another in search of the best ways of unleashing nuclear war in the hope of winning it. Engaging in this is not just irresponsible, it is insane.

Although the President spoke first of all about the Soviet Union, this speech affects the interests of all states and peoples. One should come to realize that the U.S. leaders are trying today to turn the European countries into their nuclear hostages. Washington's actions are putting the entire world in jeopardy.

Today all efforts must be directed towards one goal, that of averting nuclear catastrophe. We call decisively on the United States to take this path.

Moscow Radio Version

LD272222 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 26 Mar 83

[Text] The general secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, Yuriy Andropov, in his answers to the questions of a PRAVDA correspondent, commented on the statement by President Reagan on 23d March about the military policy of the United States.

Lately, declared Yuriy Andropov, there has been a real torrent of speeches coming thick and fast from Washington, speeches dealing with one and the same topic: military preparations, military programs and the development of new weapons systems. This time, too, the President spoke on that subject. In fact his speech boils down to the following: America must arm and become the world's dominant military power. And so in a desire to justify these hegemonistic claims, such flagrant distortions of the Soviet Union's policy are permitted and such underhand methods are used that, frankly speaking, the following question suggests itself. What kind of conceptions does the President have concerning the standards of negotiating affairs with other countries? According to the President, it appears the United States was weaker than the Soviet Union -- here, there and even at home -- and this was all because the Soviet Union in the past two decades or so had been allegedly building up its Armed Forces apace, while the United States had, so to say, been sitting idly by with its Armed Forces becoming neglected.

Yes, Yuriy Andropov says, the Soviet Union has been strengthening its defense capabilities. Faced with the hectic activities of the United States to deploy military bases close to Soviet territory and develop ever-new systems of nuclear and other weapons, the Soviet Union has been compelled to do that in order to liquidate the American military advantage for which Washington is longing so much now. The present military strategic parity has deprived the United States of the possibility to blackmail us with the nuclear threat. This parity is a reliable guarantee of peace and we shall do everything to maintain this parity.

As to the claims to the effect that the United States has not been doing anything in the past two decades, it is but naive people who could believe that. Let us turn to some of the most significant facts to corroborate this point. Yuriy Andropov pointed out it is during this period that a drastic qualitative change of the American strategic forces had occurred. Suffice it to say that the United States went over to mutual independently targeted reentry vehicles for its ballistic missiles. And the United States did this contrary to our persistent calls to refrain from doing so, so as not to start a new spiral in the missile arms race. What the result is can be clearly seen from just one example. After reequipment of this kind, one missile on an American submarine is now capable of hitting 14 targets simultaneously, and each submarine has 16 such missiles. Their aggregate capacity equals nearly 500 atom bombs similar to those dropped on Hiroshima.

On the whole, during the ostensible American inaction about which the President holds forth, the number of nuclear charges within the strategic forces of the United States grew from 4 to more than 10,000. Can one call inaction this more-than-twofold [as heard] increase in the nuclear potential? This is anything but inaction.

Now about Europe, where, according to the White House chief, the situation of the United States and of NATO in general was grave indeed. But if one turns to real facts again, it will be easy to see that the overall number of the American nuclear stockpiles has increased three fold during the same period of time and now exceeds 7,000 units. What is that, the result of inaction too? The President makes out that there are not merely 1,000 intermediate-range systems of the United States and its NATO allies in the zone of Europe and that he does not know that in the sum total of nuclear charges of these systems NATO has a one-and-a-half fold edge over the Soviet Union.

The President is not only silent on that point, he tells a deliberate untruth by contending the Soviet Union was not abiding by the unilateral moratorium it declared on the deployment of medium-range missiles. He also sidesteps the fact the American medium-range weapons are just next door to us, not just somewhere else. From this standpoint, however, there is no difference to us between them and the strategic weaponry based on U.S. territory, and this applies not only to Europe alone; hundreds and hundreds of American vehicles capable of delivering a nuclear strike on our territory are concentrated along the entire perimeter of the Soviet Union. And by the Pentagon plans, officially announced, their number should increase many times over.

It is planned to deploy over 12,000 long-range cruise missiles alone, and all this is not enought for the present American Administration. Trillions of dollars are knocked out [as heard] to have even more weaponry on the ground, in the air and in outer space. A drastic buildup of all kinds of nuclear weapons has been planned. The President has also announced large-scale steps to develop basically new systems of conventional weapons. This ushers in still another direction in the arms race.

The persistent rhetoric to the effect that all this being done in reply to a Soviet military threat can mislead no one. Everything that the Soviet Union has been and is doing, Yuriy Andropov emphasized, in no way attests to its striving for military superiority. The treaties and agreements which we have entered into and are prepared to enter into with the American side are aimed at lowering the level of a nuclear confrontation without violating the parity, that is with no prejudice to the security of either the Soviet Union or the United States. And it does not befit those who have railroaded the SALT-II treaty, which outlined exactly this goal in explicit terms, to try to pose as peacemakers. Turning down our proposals -- that the Soviet Union and NATO should have an equal number of missiles and equal number of aircraft in Europe or that there should be no nuclear weapons at all there, neither intermediate-range nor tactical -- they have the heart to speak of the Soviet Union's desire for superiority.

The methods to which the present Washington leaders resort to slander the policy of the Soviet Union are impermissible in relations between countries.

Yuriy Andropov further commented on President Reagan's speaking about new defense concept he had devised. One must dwell on this in particular, the Soviet leader said. Holding forth at great length on a Soviet military threat, President Reagan claimed it was time, as it were, to take a different approach to secure U.S. strategic interests, and in this connection, announced the beginning of the development of a large-scale and highly efficient antimissile defense system.

At first glance, some people not conversant with the matter may find this attractive. After all, the President appears to be speaking about defensive measures. But this is only at first glance and for those who are not conversant with these issues. In actual fact, however, the United States will continue to push ahead with the development and modernization of its strategic offensive forces and this in a quite definite direction, to gain a first-nuclear-strike potential. In these conditions, the intention to acquire a possibility to destroy with the aid of antimissile defenses the corresponding strategic systems of the other side, that is to deprive it of the possibility of delivering a retaliative blow, is meant to disarm the Soviet Union in the face of the American nuclear threat. This should be clearly realized if one is to assess the real meaning of that so-called new concept.

Yuriy Andropov recalled that some time ago, as the Soviet Union and the United States got down to consider the strategic armaments issue, they agreed there was an inseparable link between strategic offensive and defensive systems. And it was by no mere chance that in 1972, our two countries concluded a treaty on limiting strategic offensive weapons. In other words, the two acknowledged and registered in these documents the fact that it was mutual restraint in the field of antimissile defenses that would enable progress to be made along the road of offensive arms limitation and reduction, that is to halt and reverse the strategic arms race as a whole. But now the United States deems to break this interconnection. Should this concept be realized, it would open the sluices for an unchecked race in all kinds of strategic weaponry, both offensive and defensive. Such is the real meaning, the reverse side, so to speak, of Washington's defense concept.

Answering the question as to what general conclusion one is to draw from the American President's speech, Yuriy Andropov said the present American administration continues to pursue an exceedingly dangerous road, but no lighthearted approach like that is possible to the issues of war and peace. All attempts to gain a military supremacy over the Soviet Union are futile. The Soviet Union will never allow this to happen, it will never be unarmed in the face of any threat, and those in Washington should never forget this. It is high time that they should stop inventing ever-new options on how to unleash a nuclear war in the hope of winning it. This is an irresponsible occupation. More than that, it is an insane occupation.

Although in his speech the President dealt with the Soviet Union primarily, the speech bears out on the interests of all states and all nations. One should be aware of the fact that the American leaders are out to make European countries nuclear hostages. Washington's actions imperil the whole world and all efforts today should be concentrated on one single objective: to prevent a nuclear disaster. We are urging the United States to take this road, Yuriy Andropov said in conclusion.

That was the text of an interview by the general secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, Yuriy Andropov, for the Soviet national daily PRAVDA.

Reaction to Interview Noted

LD272350 Moscow TASS in English 1602 GMT 27 Mar 83

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS -- Yuriy Andropov's answers to questions of a PRAVDA correspondent have aroused the broadest response around the world. Articles by leading news analysts of Sunday newspapers, radio and television commentaries point out that the now achieved military and strategic parity is a reliable guarantee of peace. No impudent distortions to which the Washington administration is resorting with a view to justifying its mad policy of unbridled arms race can twist in the eyes of the world public the true goals of the Leninist foreign policy of the Soviet Union. At the same time, the mass media of many countries point out, all U.S. attempts at achieving military superiority over the USSR are futile, for, as the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee stated, the Soviet Union will never allow them to succeed, and will never be caught defenceless in the face of any aggression.

THE NEW YORK TIMES reports that, although the White House has not yet reacted to Yuriy Andropov's answers, officials in Washington read the text of the answers literally several minutes after receiving them. The newspaper writes that the same officials admitted that the Reagan plan which was so sharply criticised by the Soviet leader was announced by the U.S. President without a preliminary discussion with the leaders of the allies.

The newspaper writes that Yuriy Andropov's interview has shown that the stand of the Soviet Union is uncompromising. The tone of the interview was determined by the Soviet leader's estimate that Reagan told a deliberate lie.

THE WASHINGTON POST in a dispatch from Moscow points out that Soviet leader Yuriy Andropov has accused President Ronald Reagan of using questionable strategems in a bid to substantiate his hegemonist claims. The implementation of the Reagan concept would actually result in the opening of the floodgates of a runaway race of all types of strategic arms -- both offensive and defensive ones.

An NBC commentary has it that in the interview styled in tones unusually sharp for Moscow Yuriy Andropov told PRAVDA that Reagan's new strategic concept is aimed at disarming the Soviet Union in the face of the U.S. nuclear threat. In the interview Reagan's position on military problems is criticised point after point. A CBS news analyst stated that Yuriy Andropov has accused the Washington administration of continuing to tread an extremely perilous path, since one must not treat the issues of war and peace so flippantly as is done in Washington.

THE LONDON TIMES emphasizes that the greatest danger is that the U.S. President's decision will obviously prevent progress at the negotiations on limiting and reducing strategic arms.

The speech by the head of the U.S. Administration has alarmed the U.S. allies rather than calm them. The peoples of the world call for an end to the arms race, and not for enhancing it in a new direction. The newspaper SUNDAY TIMES for its part stresses that the Reagan program for the development of newest anti-missile weapons has met with a rather cool reception in Europe. British scientists who are familiar with this problem regard the statement by the head of the White House as ill-considered and hasty. The newspaper MORNING STAR writes that it becomes increasingly clear that Ronald Reagan's statements about U.S. readiness to reach agreement at the negotiations on limiting and reducing strategic arms are only a ploy in an attempt to mislead peace workers.

"Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has issued a call to prevent a nuclear catastrophe. He resolutely urged the United States to take this path," writes the French L'HUMANITE DIMANCHE. Thereby, the newspaper points out, Yuriy Andropov gave a reply to President Reagan's speech which has given rise to a wave of condemnation in the West and first of all in the USA, Britain, and the FRG. Although the U.S. President in his speech referred first of all to the Soviet Union, it affects the interests of all states and peoples. One should be aware that U.S. leaders now try to turn European countries into nuclear hostages. Washington's actions threaten the entire world.

The West German news agency DDP points out: "Having described Reagan's new defence concept as frenzy, the Soviet leader accused the USA of frustrating the first agreement on the limitation of strategic offensive arms and the treaty on the limitation of ABM systems."

Another West German news agency, DPA, reports that the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, answering PRAVDA's questions, stated that the USSR had to strengthen its defence capability in the face of U.S. feverish activities for the establishment of military bases near Soviet territory and for the development of ever new types of nuclear and other weapons. The USSR was compelled to do so exclusively for the sake of offsetting the U.S. military superiority for which Washington is now pining so much.

The military and strategic parity achieved has deprived the USA of a possibility to blackmail the Soviet Union with a nuclear threat, points out the Italian news agency ANSA. The parity is a reliable guarantee of peace, and the Soviet Union will do everything to keep it. It is precisely this conclusion that suggests itself upon acquaintance with the Soviet leader's extremely thorough answers to the newspaper PRAVDA. In his answers Yuriy Andropov disproved one after another the U.S. President's assertions as to Washington's ostensible inactivity in the field of arms in the past twenty years.

The Italian CORRIERE DELLA SERA writes: "the quickness with which the USSR replied to Reagan's speech is indicative not only of a dynamic style of leadership but also of the fact that Moscow is clearly aware of the real state of affairs in relations between the USSR and the USA".

Yuriy Andropov, reports the Austrian news agency, APA, has accused Reagan of instigating war, and disproved the U.S. President's assertions that Moscow does not observe its own unilateral moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles. As far as the new U.S. "defence concept" is concerned, it, as Yuriy Andropov has shown in a well-argumented way, boiled down to a continuation of development and upgrading of a first strike capability at full tilt. By acting so the USA continues to tread an extremely perilous path.

"Lies and deception of Reagan are exposed," "The USSR is ready for mutual reduction of arms" is how the Cyprus KHARAVYI comments on Yuriy Andropov's answers. The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the newspaper writes, has disproved President Reagan's mendacious pronouncements contained in his recent statement on matters of U.S. military policy. The Soviet leader on the strength of facts and figures convincingly proved that it is precisely the United States that is conducting the arms race around the world.

A firm warning to Washington!" "Sharp criticism of U.S. plans for the creation of new types of nuclear arms," "The USA opens the way for a runaway arms race" are the headlines in Japanese Sunday newspapers. "Yuriy Andropov emphasized the fact that the 'new defence concept' of the USA is aimed at disarming the Soviet Union in the face of the U.S. nuclear threat," MAINICHI points out. "However, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee has issued a firm rebuff to President Reagan by stating that all attempts at achieving military superiority over the USSR are futile."

THE TIMES OF INDIA stresses that voiced in Moscow has been a call to mankind to realize that the frenzied plans of U.S. leaders involve the interests of all states and peoples and threaten the whole world. The newspaper HINDUSTAN TIMES describes as a trite trick the attempt of the White House at wresting from Congress additional appropriations for armaments through inventions as to some growing danger on the part of the USSR.

Yuriy Andropov's answers to questions of a PRAVDA correspondent have met with an immense interest and full support in the countries of the socialist community.

U.S. SPACE 'MILITARIZATION' PLANS SCORED

PM281055 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 83 First Edition p 5

[Andrey Kozyrev commentary: "Militarist in Space"]

[Text] In its plans to achieve military superiority over the USSR the U.S. Administration allocates a prominent place to the program for the militarization of space. A special presidential directive defines the directions for realizing it.

And a few days ago the master of the White House publicly declared that Washington has far-reaching plans for the arms race in space. He means the creation of an ABM and space defense system.

In the United States, as is known, a weapons system is being developed at an increasing pace in the interests of conducting military operations in and from space. Plans to create and deploy missile and laser weapons in space are being realized, including with the use of the reusable space shuttle. According to the Pentagon's plans, the ABM and space defense systems are to be capable of intercepting targets both in space and in dense layers of the atmosphere by utilizing the latest means of destruction, including MIRVed warheads banned by the Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of ABM systems.

Washington is now presenting all this almost as an effort to reduce the danger of a nuclear missile conflict breaking out. But in reality the direct opposite is the case. The Pentagon's plans in the sphere of building up strategic offensive arms and developing the ABM and space systems -- plans coordinated in terms of the schedule for fulfilling them -- are aimed at completing the creation of a so-called strike potential in the eighties.

This policy, which is tantamount to flouting the spirit of the 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, creates a threat of strategic destabilization and leads to increased danger of nuclear catastrophe. It contradicts the will of the overwhelming majority of the world's states, which, as the specially adopted resolution of the 37th UN General Assembly session points out, is to see space used only for peaceful purposes and not become an arena of the arms race. It is significant that the United States voted in total isolation against this resolution, which was supported by 138 UN members.

By blocking the realization of UN recommendations Washington is preventing the creation of a special working group within the Disarmament Committee now sitting in Geneva to prepare for talks on the conclusion of an agreement to prevent an arms race in space in all its aspects.

As is known, the initiative in raising the question of concluding such an agreement belongs to the Soviet Union, which as much as 2 years ago submitted a draft treaty banning the deployment of weapons of any kind in space for consideration by the UN member states and then by the Disarmament Committee. The Soviet Union has also stated its readiness to resume the Soviet-American talks on antisatellite systems, which were unilaterally broken off by the United States. The United Nations has also advocated this. However, no positive response has been forthcoming from the American side.

The task of preventing an arms race in space is acquiring ever greater acuteness and becoming one of the most important directions in the struggle to stop warmongers, preserve peace and prevent militarist forces from utilizing the achievements of human genius to destroy life itself on earth.

'Extremely Dangerous Escalation'

LD260755 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0720 GMT 26 Mar 83

[Text] Washington, 26 Mar (TASS) -- U.S. President Reagan on Friday signed a National Security Council Directive that marks the beginning of a new and extremely dangerous escalation of the arms race by the United States. The document envisages "intensive efforts" towards launching a "long-term program of research and development with the aim of creating antimissile systems that are new in principle.

These systems will be based on land as well as in space and will make use of the latest weapons, including beam [luch] and laser weapons.

At a special White House press conference, an administration spokesman announced that the United States is already spending about $1 billion annually for these purposes. By the 1985 fiscal year, he said, these appropriations will be "increased perceptibly."

The building of the new antimissile systems envisaged by the directive is seen by experts and political figures as a breach of the Soviet-American agreements on anti-missile defense.

U.S. REACTION TO REAGAN 'MILITARIST' SPEECH NOTED

LD272316 Moscow TASS in English 1730 GMT 27 Mar 83

[Text] Washington March 27 TASS -- The television militarist speech by President Ronald Reagan who called for sharp build-up of U.S. strategic offensive potential gives rise to resolute criticism among the broadest sections of the U.S. public, sober-minded politicians and scientists.

The President's bellicose rhetoric and his attempts at stirring up militarist hysteria in the USA still more have been condemned by Thomas O'Neil, speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and Robert Byrd, leader of the Democratic minority in the Senate. In an official reply of the Democratic Party, which was read out by Senator Daniel Inouye, Reagan is accused of deliberate distortion of the true correlation of forces between the USA and the Soviet Union for the purpose of winning congressional approval of the astronomic military budget and of diverting the Americans' attention from appalling failures of his economic policy.

The senator pointed out that the President seeks to sow fear in the hearts of Americans and to instill in their heads the idea of inevitability of a nuclear war. He said the President is trying to create a false impression that the United States sat idle while the Soviet Union was allegedly building up its nuclear potential. "Mr President," Inouye emphasized, "you know that is not true." He said the President is drawing a distorted picture.

Senator Edward Kennedy, a prominent figure of the Democratic Party, pointed out that Reagan deliberately hoodwinks the Americans and intimidates them with a "Red threat". Senator Alan Cranston emphasized for his part that the aim of that hackneyed stratagem is to impose a further increase in military expenditures on the country.

Senator Gary Hart said in an ABC interview that the administration, in its plans to create a Reagan-announced new powerful ABM system, proceeds from the premise that the USA is ostensibly in a position to win a victory in a nuclear war. The senator pointed out that the deployment of that system would be a destabilising factor, would diminish the security of the sides and would lead to a new dangerous spiral in the arms race.

The same opinion is also shared by many prominent representatives of scientific circles. According to Mr Jackson, expert of the Brookings Institution, the Soviet Union will quite justly regard that program as an evidence that the USA is preparing to deliver a first nuclear strike. Mr Panowski, a prominent U.S. scientist, professor at Stanford University, has described as extremely dangerous from strategic point of view Washington's intention to create an ABM system both on land and in space with the use of newest weapons. He pointed out that President Reagan in point of fact is trying to draw U.S. scientists into a new venture the type of 'Manhattan Project' which resulted in the creation of the atomic bomb.

A group of 17 authoritative experts, among them such prominent figures as Nobel Prize winners Mr Bete, professor at Cornell University; and Mr Rabi, professor at the University of Columbia; astrophysicist James Van Allen; Noel Gayler, former director of the National Defence Agency; and others, have sent a petition to the White House. In the petition they emphasize the need to ban the deployment of all types of weapons in the near-earth space. The petition says that the experts are convinced that the planned tests and deployment of any weapons in space would sharply increase the threat of a nuclear war on earth. The newspaper PHILADELPHIA ENQUIRER describes those plans as a dangerous action of recklessness. The newspaper stresses that this is an instigatory step, an unprecedented one in the entire post-war period, on the part of the U.S. Administration along the lines of enhancing the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

For its part, THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR points out that Reagan's militarist course runs counter to the demands by a majority of Americans for slashing military appropriations, according to the results of a public opinion poll taken by TIME MAGAZINE jointly with the Yankelovich Service, 60 percent of the U.S. electorate are of the opinion that the Pentagon's budget can be slashed without any detriment to U.S. national security. Former U.S. Defence Secretary Robert McNamara has stated in an ABC interview that the military expenditures, planned for the coming years, can be quite painlessly cut down by 150,000 million dollars. With this end in view one should only renounce those utterly unrealistic tasks which Reagan sets in the military field.

U.S. ECONOMIC PRESSURE ON USSR CRITICIZED

West European Partners Concerned

LD260934 Moscow TASS in English 0816 GMT 26 Mar 83

[Text] Moscow March 26 TASS -- The U.S. National Security Council has issued a new document asking the U.S. administration among other things to intensify economic pressure on the USSR, Yuriy Kharlanov writes in PRAVDA today. According to press reports, the U.S. President receives the right to cancel at his own discretion foreign contracts the way he tried to do by announcing a U.S. embargo on supplies within the framework of the "gas-pipes" contract.

The author notes that a fresh attempt of the White House at hindering East-West trade caused concern among the Western European partners of the United States. During his trip to Washington Peter Rees, Britain's minister of state, Department of Trade, intends to raise the question concerning a change in U.S. establishment on export control. The minister of external relations of France, Claude Cheysson, reiterated in an interview with THE WASHINGTON POST a few days ago that France was categorically opposed to the establishment of what he called on "economic NATO" and intended to develop its mutually beneficial trade with the Soviet Union.

A short time back the Danish Folketing rejected by a vast majority of votes a bill on extending trade "sanctions" against the Soviet Union which had been introduced under U.S. pressure, Yuriy Kharlanov recalls.

A number of newspapers and magazines in the United States and outside it bitterly criticised the Washington directive. The papers recall that attempts at an economic blockade of the USSR ended in a dismal failure in the 1920's and during the cold war. And of course, they will come to nothing now when the Soviet Union has accumulated a vast economic potential. "If the new directive brings results at all, this is going to be a serious strain in relations between the United States and its allies", the author writes in conclusion.

'Prospectless Policy' of 'Economic Blackmail'

LD252352 Moscow TASS in English 2157 GMT 25 Mar 83

[Text] Moscow March 25 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Ivan Ablamov writes:

The sharply negative comments in the West on Directive 75 signed by President Reagan is a manifestation of a natural reaction. The attempts to force on the Soviet Union through economic blackmail a home and foreign policy welcome to Washington is viewed in the West not only as a dangerous and short-sighted course, but also as a prospectless one. It is silly to believe that pressure on such a powerful state as the USSR will produce the desired effect, this is the opinion now of both the leading press media, and political figures and businessmen.

In the past too, as is known, economic war against the USSR did not halt its economic growth. Moreover, as noted experts point out, the years when the economic war against the Soviet Union was waged particularly fiercely, saw a most impressive upswing of the Soviet economy, a further strengthening of the USSR's international prestige.

Nowadays the economic potential of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community is such that the "trade embargo" policy pursued by the USA is powerless to change the Soviet Union's stand. But the need for developing East-West economic ties is dictated not by somebody's subjective wishes, but by an objective regularity: Mutually beneficial interest, international division of labour and the bad need felt in the Western countries for widening exports in the context of an economic crisis.

Washington's Directive 75 is spearheaded against the USSR, but it will hit the heaviest the interests of the USA itself and its allies. It is apt to recall the wise statement expressed by a participant in a conference in Washington, which was held on the initiative of the American Chamber of Commerce, who said that as historical experience indisputably testifies, all sorts of discriminatory measures boomerang against those who use them.

U.S. companies have lost billions of dollars and tens of thousands jobs because of Reagan's policy of economic sanctions against the USSR. The West European allies of the USA do not wish to repeat this mistake. In 1982 the West European nations acting contrary to crudest American pressure increased their trade with the USSR by 4.7 per cent as compared with 1981. Its total volume reached the 29,700 million roubles mark. The economic relations between the Soviet Union and the West European states are based on more than twenty inter-governmental agreements on economic, industrial and scientific-technical cooperation.

The idea that trade does not serve towards disuniting peoples, but on the contrary, is a powerful means for strengthening peace and detente, building confidence, is making headway notwithstanding the fact that the Reagan administration is hell-bent on torpedoing international economic cooperation. We do not need cold war. We do not wish to lose trade partners, when the point at issue is that of millions of jobs in the West. This statement in the Canadian newspaper TORONTO STAR is a reflection of the views of many politicians and businessmen in the West, including in the USA itself.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON TIKHONOV VISIT TO SFRY

Planinc, Tikhonov Dinner Speeches

PM251147 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Mar 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In a Warm, Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] Belgrade, 23 Mar -- On 22 March M. Planinc, president of the SFRY Federal Executive Council, gave a dinner in honor of N.A. Tikhonov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

The dinner in the federal chamber was attended by Yugoslav party and state figures, representatives of the public and journalists. The Soviet officials accompanying N.A. Tikhonov were present.

The heads of government exchanged speeches during the dinner.

Comrade M. Planinc's Speech

It gives me great pleasure to greet you, Comrade Chairman, and your associates most cordially and to wish you a pleasant stay in our country, M. Planinc said.

The relations of friendship and cooperation between our peoples have strong and deep historical roots going back to the days of Great October. They were strengthened still further in the bloody struggle during the liberation war against the fascist invaders.

We are pleased, esteemed Comrade N.A. Tikhonov, that during your brief stay in our country you will be able to assure yourself of the friendly feelings which our peoples and ethnic groups have for the Soviet Union's peoples. You will also be able to familiarize yourself with our woking people's achievements in building a socialist self-managing society, with our successes and also with the difficulties which we are overcoming.

We regard your visit as an expression of the joint desire and readiness to ensure that our mutual relations and successful all-around cooperation in all spheres continue to be developed and enriched in the interests of our peoples and in the interests of peace and socialism throughout the world. I wish particularly to emphasize that in broadening friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union we follow the ideas and cause of Josip Broz Tito, who for many years devoted attention to cooperation with the USSR and made a great personal contribution to the development of friendly relations between the two countries. We believe that all the conditions exist for the further development of friendship and cooperation between our countries and parties on the principles of independence, equal rights, sovereignty, noninterference, mutual respect and trust. These principles contained in the 1955 Belgrade declaration, the 1956 Moscow statement and also in other documents adopted during summit meetings between our two countries' leaders represent an irreplaceable basis for stable relations and fruitful cooperation. They received new confirmation during the recent meetings between P. Stambolic, president of the SFRY Presidency, and M. Ribicic, president of the LCY Central Committee Presidium, and Yu.Y. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Developing our relations on the aforesaid principles, we have achieved significant results in all spheres. Cooperation between our republics, districts and cities draws closer the peoples and ethnic groups of the SFRY and the USSR. In many spheres it has opened up new concrete possibilities for the further development of relations. Many of our sociopolitical organizations are cooperating very successfully. Fruitful ties are maintained in the spheres of culture, science and education. This cooperation mutually enriches us with spiritual and cultural values and with the creative achievements of the two countries' peoples.

I wish to emphasize with satisfaction that economic cooperation is developing successfully between our countries. The high level of commodity turnover reached represents a solid basis for its further upsurge and qualitative improvement. We believe that good conditions have been created and that there is mutual interest in developing more substantive forms of economic cooperation, such as collaboration and specialization in many economic spheres, in introducing new and more diverse forms and, which is particularly important, imparting a long-term nature to them. We expect all this to promote the stable and harmonious nature of our economic relations as a whole and promote their further expansion.

Broad and intensive work is being done in our country to implement the 12th LCY Congress decisions and, above all, the economic stabilization program. We are fully resolved to overcome the difficulties by relying on our own resources. We possess all the sociopolitical, economic and cadre potential necessary to realize this. To this end the LCY and Yugoslavia's working class are making determined efforts to further develop socialist self-management and the delegate political system and to further strengthen the fraternity, unity and equality of rights of all Yugoslavia's peoples and ethnic groups.

Our country's working people attentively follow and sincerely rejoice at the successes which the Soviet Union's peoples are achieving under the CPSU's leadership in their creative labor and in the USSR's social, economic, scientific and cultural development.

I am convinced that the prospects for our cooperation and the development of relations can be evaluated as good and giving every ground for optimism. This is evidenced by the results achieved so far. If certain differences in the approach to certain bilateral or international questions, be it the specifics of internal development or of the international position of our countries, arise on this path -- which is a normal phenomenon -- I am sure that we will treat them with respect and, consequently, overcome them.

The peoples of the whole world are profoundly concerned at the deepening crisis in international relations and disturbed at the threat to peace and security. We see the only possibility of a way out of this difficult international situation in the urgent resumption of detente and a return to the policy of negotiation. The detente process can be lasting and full only if it embraces all regions and all problems of the modern world, and also if all countries and peoples participate in this process on the basis of equal rights. The universality of detente is the demand of the present moment.

Peace and security are threatened most of all by the existence of numerous seats of crises and open conflicts. The "position of strength" policy, interference, pressure, intervention and aggression -- these are the main causes of these crises. Nonaligned Yugoslavia has always supported victims of pressure and aggression. The Near East region continues to remain the most dangerous seat of crisis in the world as a consequence of Israel's aggressive and expansionist policy against neighboring Arab countries and, above all, against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples. The African Continent is also being subjected to increased external pressure -- which is leading to the emergence of new seats of crisis and the deepening of existing ones. We are particularly concerned at the continuing war between Iran and Iraq -- countries friendly to us -- in which everyone loses and no one wins. We would like an end to be put to enmity as soon as possible and peace talks to begin. And in other parts of the world -- Asia and Latin America -- seats of crises and conflicts are being exacerbated. Within the framework of the Nonaligned Movement and at the United Nations Yugoslavia will advocate ending this dangerous development.

The worsening of the situation is also reflected in the situation in Europe. We are sure that the negative development of events on our continent can and must be halted. The Madrid meeting of representatives of the CSCE participant states is giving a new boost to the process of European security and cooperation. Here special significance is attached to the agreement to convene a conference on measures to strengthen confidence and security and on disarmament in Europe. Therefore Yugoslavia, together with other nonaligned and neutral European countries, will make every effort to ensure that this meeting ends successfully.

The arms race -- in both nuclear and conventional arms -- is assuming frightening proportions and threatening the world with the emergence of armed clashes having unpredictable consequences. Therefore it is understandable that the policy of confrontation and rivalry in combination with the creation of new generations of nuclear and other weapons is meeting with an increasingly strong rebuff from the world's peoples. Yugoslavia does not accept the arms race as a means of establishing equilibrium and security. Yugoslavia resolutely advocates the cessation of this race and real disarmament. We support all initiatives and proposals which really open up the prospects of realizing these aims.

We follow attentively the initiatives of the Soviet Government and the CPSU, which follow the line of easing international tension and discussing urgent international problems. The orientation toward resolving all open questions by means of negotiation has met with a positive response from our country's working people. We perceived with respect and understanding the recent USSR Supreme Soviet and CPSU Central Committee appeal addressed to the world's parliaments, governments, political parties and peoples. We evaluate that appeal, as well as the recent initiatives and proposals of Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, as positive and useful, which must be examined with due attention and seriousness.

Lasting and effective peace and security can be achieved only on condition of the active participation of the entire international community, and special significance attaches here to the further strengthening of the role, the democratization and the enhancement of the effectiveness of the existing machinery for international negotiations within the UN framework.

The process of development in recent years has confirmed that the developing countries' problems and the deepening of the gulf between the economically developed and the underdeveloped countries are one of the most serious sources of instability in the world. Resolving these problems is the only way out of the world social and economic crisis -- which accords with everyone's interests. We are sure that global talks are the best way to resolve the chief international economic problems, The upcoming sixth UNCTAD conference, to be held in Belgarde, presents an opportunity to begin the process of multilateral efforts in the search for a way out of the present crisis.

As an independent force, the Nonaligned Movement, of which Yugoslavia is a member, takes an active part in the struggle to build new and democratic international political and economic relations and makes its contribution to the cause of ending the present unfavorable world processes.

The seventh conference of nonaligned countries' heads of state and government, which has just concluded its work in Delhi, once again demonstrated firm determination and unity in the question of the need to take urgent measures for the speedy and cardinal resolution of the world problems which have accumulated. Within the framework of the Nonaligned Movement's policy Yugoslavia will spare no effort in the struggle for peace, cooperation, security and the progress of the world community.

I am sure that your visit and talks will be a new contribution to the further development of friendly relations between our countries and will give a new boost to the mutual desire to develop friendship and cooperation in the interests of our countries' peoples and of peace and socialism.

Expressing the profound friendly feelings of all the Yugoslav peoples and ethnic groups, M. Planinc proposed a toast to the all-around progress of the Soviet Union, the health of Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, the health of Comrade N.A. Tikhonov and the strengthening of friendship and cooperation between our countries.

Comrade N.A. Tikhonov's Speech

Allow me to express sincere gratitude for the invitation to visit the SFRY and for the cordial, friendly welcome, N.A. Tikhonov said.

The comradely atmosphere of our meeting emphasizes the closeness of the peoples of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia and their friendship, which has glorious traditions. Our peoples have repeatedly come out against common enemies, for the righteous cause of freedom and independence and for the victory of the revolution's cause. Soviet people will always keep in their memory the names of the Yugoslav internationalist volunteers who were participants in Great October. We will never forget our joint struggle in the years of World War II, when Soviet and Yugoslav servicemen marched shoulder to shoulder toward victory over fascism.

I can state with complete conviction that Soviet-Yugoslav relations are built today on the strong foundation -- tested by experience -- of equitable and mutually advantageous cooperation. Our common readiness to further develop and strengthen all-around ties between the USSR and the SFRY and between the CPSU and the LCY received new confirmation during the Moscow meeting last November between Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Comrade P. Stambolic, president of the SFRY Presidency, and Comrade M. Ribicic, president of the LCY Central Committee Presidium.

Fruitful cooperation between our countries is expanding. It embraces diverse spheres of politics, economics and scientific, technical and cultural activity. The exchange of delegations and visits by leading figures along party and state lines and contacts between public organizations have firmly entered the practice of our relations.

The ties between the Soviet and Yugoslav republics and districts are becoming increasingly close with every passing year.

And all this has yielded good results. Trade between our countries is growing constantly -- which is particularly noteworthy against the background of the complications in international economic relations. The Soviet Union is giving economic and technical assistance in the construction and modernization of enterprises in the SFRY, while Yugoslav construction workers are erecting industrial and other projects in the USSR. We share the opinion voiced by you, esteemed Comrade Milka Planinc, that good conditions have been created and that there is mutual interest in developing more substantive forms of economic cooperation, such as collaboration and specialization in many spheres. In short, Soviet-Yugoslav relations are fruitful and accord with the interests of the peoples of Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union.

I would like to emphasize that the Soviet Union will continue to organize its relations with Socialist Yugoslavia so that they develop along the tested course of friendship and cooperation and are in keeping with the common interests of the struggle for social progress and peace throughout the world. We can see that this, too, is the desire of the Yugoslav leadership. This means that there are good prospects for relations between the USSR and the SFRY. Our talks are showing that these prospects can be filled with constructive and vital meaning.

In evaluating the prospects, of course, we cannot disregard the external conditions. The world today is going through an exceptionally crucial stage. Tension has increased and the threat to peace and all mankind has grown as a result of the activities of aggressive imperialist circles, the United States above all. Attempts are also being made to hinder the development of economic links. Cooperation in the economic, cultural, scientific and technical spheres is surrounded by artificial and contrived obstacles. A high level of activity by all forces advocating peace, increased security and the normalization of international relations is especially important in this alarming situation. All countries, be they developed or developing, large or small, bear responsibility for the fate of peace, for mankind's very existence.

A focal point in the struggle to liquidate the danger of war is occupied by the task of curbing the arms race and moving on to disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament. The year 1983 could turn out to be decisive for the fate of Europe, and not only of Europe. The realization of the militarist plans of the United States and the NATO bloc to deploy hundreds of new U.S. nuclear missiles in West Europe would create a threat to states' security and undermine stability on our continent.

Proceeding from the interests of peace and security, the Soviet Union proposes either that no nuclear weapons at all be deployed in Europe, be they medium-range or tactical weapons, or that all medium-range weapons in this region be reduced by more than two-thirds. The interests of peace also dictated the proposal by the socialist countries to conclude a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace between the Warsaw Pact states and NATO countries.

In pursuit of the very same goals the socialist countries have put forward in Vienna a new initiative making it possible to overcome the deadlock artificially created by the Western participants in the talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe and to move on in the very near future to reducing the level of military confrontation.

The Soviet Union has also responded positively to the Swedish proposal to create in Europe a zone free of theater nuclear weapons, and has spoken in favor of the idea of creating nuclear-free zones in north Europe and the Balkans and of turning the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and cooperation.

We do not claim a monopoly in the work to strengthen peace. On the contrary, in making its proposals in the quest for the best solution to the urgent problems of our times our country is always prepared to discuss constructive and honest initiatives from others. The Soviet Union is doing everything in its power to secure the triumph of common sense in international affairs. We are convinced that, through joint efforts by peace-loving forces, it will be possible to halt the world's slide toward catastrophe, ensure the normalization of the situation and strengthen international security. The antiwar surge is gathering strength, and no one will find it possible to sabotage indefinitely the peace-loving initiatives of the socialist countries and the Nonaligned Movement or to go against the will of millions of people in all countries and all continents.

We have respect for the Nonaligned Movement which was formed here, in Belgrade, more than 20 years ago. It is playing an increasingly constructive role in the cause of strengthening peace and international security, the liquidation of crisis situations and the defense of the independence of states and peoples who have liberated themselves from colonial slavery. We acclaim this orientation of the movement, which was clearly manifested also at its seventh conference in Delhi.

The Soviet People know about Yugoslavia's efforts aimed at ensuring peace and easing tension, at strengthening international cooperation. We value highly Yugoslavia's positive attitude toward the Soviet peace initiatives.

We can say with satisfaction that on the fundamental issues of war and peace and of disarmament the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia share a common language, and we hope that mutual understanding and joint actions on these issues will continue to develop and strengthen. While in these cases where there are differences in our approach to individual problems, the important thing is not to let them overshadow the main element that unites our countries.

Today we have discussed in detail the questions of Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation in different spheres and have exchanged views on a number of international problems, including the measures that must be implemented for relations between states to run their normal course, something that is so necessary for all countries. I am convinced that these talks will help strengthen the friendly links between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia for the good of our peoples and in the interests of universal peace.

With all our heart we wish Yugoslavia's peoples and ethnic groups successes in building socialism and a peaceful and happy life.

In conclusion N.A. Tikhonov proposed a toast to the further strengthening of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, the health of Comrade Petar Stambolic, the health of Comrade Mitja Ribicic and the health of Comrade Milka Planinc.

The speeches were listened to with attention and received with applause. The luncheon took place in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Tikhonov, Stambolic 24 Mar Speeches

PM252343 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Mar 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] Belgrade, 25 Mar -- P. Stambolic, president of the SFRY Presidency gave a luncheon yesterday in honor of N.A. Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Greeting the head of the Soviet Government, the president of the SFRY Presidency said: Today we have many reasons for being extremely satisfied with the development of mutual cooperation. The results achieved in the economic and all other spheres speak for themselves. We also have many reasons for being able to say that each Yugoslav-Soviet meeting is not only an expressive manifestation of the friendly relations between our countries but also makes a contribution to the cause of comprehensive mutual cooperation to which we attach the greatest significance and to which such impetus is necessary and useful in order that it may develop still more in accordance with opportunities and mutual aspirations.

Your visit to Yugoslavia, the results of which are already showing up clearly, confirm the important achievement of Yugoslav-Soviet relations to whose building and consolidation, in line with well-known principles, President J. Broz Tito's meetings with top Soviet leaders made an exceptional contribution.

Stressing that our relations are based on the principles of equal rights and friendship and this accords in the best possible way with the interests of both peoples and with the development of socialism, peace and progress in the world, P. Stambolic particularly noted the significance of conversations with the Soviet leaders and in particular with Comrade Yu.V. Andropov in Moscow in November of last year.

We are committed to strengthening and developing our friendship still more, he said. We have always proceeded from the premise that broad and open cooperation, and a dialogue based on mutual respect and understanding can lead to the development and consolidation of trust between countries and peoples.

We are deeply confident that the struggle for the consolidation of peace and security, for independent, free development and progress is the most important task in which all countries must find points of contact. Nonaligned, Socialist Yugoslavia lends support to all actions and proposals leading to the ending of the arms race and to the attainment of accords aimed at general and complete disarmament.

Therefore, said P. Stambolic, I should like to stress that we treat with great respect your country's recent initiatives and proposals. We see this as confirmation of those efforts which are promoting the improvement of the overall political climate and thereby, of international cooperation.

Replying, N.A. Tikhonov said: When the Politburo of our party's Central Committee was deciding the question of my visit to Yugoslavia in accordance with the invitation received, everyone was unanimous in the opinion it is necessary to conduct matters toward the further strengthening of Soviet-Yugoslav relations, toward the consistent development of our cooperation in all spheres where there is mutual interest.

We want Soviet-Yugoslav relations to be even more stable and for them to be built on the basis of equal rights and mutual respect. For our part, we will do everything in our power to strengthen our friendship. Our talks and meetings in Yugoslavia have been aimed at this. The peoples of our countries have always cherished good feelings toward each other and have considered themselves to be brothers. Joint struggle has strengthened these bonds of friendship still more. The Soviet people want to to see Yugoslavia strong, cohesive, flourishing, and successfully building socialism. This is our deeply sincere desire.

The most important aim of our parties and states is to preserve peace on earth and to continue the movement forward along the path of progress. The implementation of the plans of peaceful construction, the successes of our cooperation in all spheres depend to a great extent on the international situation which has currently become seriously exacerbated thorugh the fault of the imperialist forces. In order to eliminate the nuclear threat hanging over the peoples we must act cohesively, pooling our efforts with all progressive and peace-loving forces. We are deeply convinced that peace can be preserved and consolidated, and, moreover, without detriment to anyone's security.

The recent initiatives of the Warsaw Pact states which were put forward at the Prague session of the leaders of those states are aimed at achieving that objective.

The Soviet people, like the peoples of the nonaligned countries do not need any war, N.A. Tikhonov stressed. We treat with great respect everything positive that the Nonaligned Movement contributes to international life and we welcome the contribution which has been made by the seventh conference of the heads of state and government of the nonaligned countries that ended recently in Delhi.

The luncheon was held in a warm, friendly atmosphere.

USSR-SFRY Communique

LD251156 Moscow TASS in English 1741 GMT 25 Mar 83

[Text] Moscow March 25 TASS -- The Soviet Union and Yugoslavia have expressed profound concern about the dangerous aggravation of the situation in the world. This is pointed out in a joint Soviet-Yugoslav communique, which was issued today upon completion of the official friendly visit to Yugoslavia of Nikolay Tikhonov, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. The sides have stressed the need for taking urgent measures aimed at strengthening peace, security, and international detente.

The heads of the Governments of the USSR and Yugoslavia are unanimous that the build-up of the arms race constitutes the most dangerous threat to peace and security. They point out that in the situation, which has taken shape, one of the most important objectives is to take urgent measures for putting an end to the arms build-up, to reach agreements that would ensure a limitation and reduction of armed forces and arms, especially nuclear arms, on the basis of equality and equal security and carrying out real disarmament, above all, nuclear disarmament.

The need was stressed for taking specific measures so as to start disarmament in Europe, where huge arsenals of nuclear and conventional weapons are stockpiled. In this context they declare for scrapping all types of nuclear weapons in Europe -- both medium-range and tactical ones, and for the limitation and reduction of conventional types of weapons and armed forces on the European Continent.

The USSR and the SFRY declare for holding and invigorating talks on the whole package of issues pertaining to the limitation, reduction of arms and disarmament, and expect all participants to take resolute efforts in order to achieve specific positive results.

In discussing the situation in Europe, the heads of the governments specially pointed out the need for strengthening peace, security, confidence and cooperation among states, implementing the principles and provisions of the Final Helsinki Act, continuing and deepening the process, which was started by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

They declare for a successful completion of the Madrid meeting with the adoption of a meaningful and balanced document, reaching agreement on the convocation of a conference on measures to build confidence, security and on disarmament in Europe.

The Soviet side set forth in detail the content of the initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community aimed at strengthening peace and international security. In that connection the importance was stressed of the proposal to conclude a treaty on mutual non-use of military force and maintaining relations of peace between the Warsaw Treaty member-countries, on the one hand, and the North Atlantic treaty member-states on the other.

The sides have expressed serious concern about the Middle East situation, which strongly aggravated as a result of the Israeli aggression against Lebanon, the connivance at Israel's unbridled expansionist policy, violation of the U.N. decisions by Israel, occupation of a part of Lebanon's territory and especially genocide against the Palestinian people.

They declare for a comprehensive and just political settlement in the Middle East, which must be based on the implementation of the inalienable legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including the right to the creation of its own state, withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967, the recognition of PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, and the right of all states in that area to safe and independent existence and development. The sides have expressed a positive attitude to the principles of resolving the problem of Middle East settlement, which were put forward by the Arab summit meeting in Fes and the 16th session of the National Council of Palestine.

The sides declare their support for the struggle for the elimination of colonialism, neocolonialism and apartheid, condemn the aggressive actions of the racist regime of the Republic of South Africa against the independent states of Southern Africa. They support the liberation struggle by the people of Namibia led by its sole genuine representative -- SWAPO, and demand that the U.N. decisions on the granting of independence to Namibia be implemented in full and without further delay.

The Soviet Union and Yuguslavia have reaffirmed their stand for a restructuring of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis, for establishing a new world economic order. The sides have stressed the need for the speediest start of global talks in keeping with the U.N. decisions.

The USSR and the SFRY declare for enhancing the role and effectiveness of the U.N. in international life as an important instrument of preserving peace and international security, a peaceful settlement of vital international problems, development of equitable cooperation between states and assistance to economic and social progress on the basis of strict observance of the U.N. Charter by all states.

The communique also says that the sides have expressed satisfaction with the level of multifaceted relations between the USSR and Yugoslavia and have reaffirmed the determination of their governments to carry on strengthening and developing relations of friendship and mutually beneficial cooperation on the basis of respect for the principles of independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, equality and non-interference, which are contained in the Belgrade Declaration of 1955, the Moscow Statement of 1956, as well as in other joint documents adopted as a result of summit meetings, which constitute a solid foundation of Soviet-Yugoslav relations.

During the visit the heads of the governments of the two states signed "the guidelines for the implementation of the long-term programme for economic and scientific-technical cooperation between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yuguslav until the year of 1990."

Officials Accompanying Tikhonov Listed

LD252350 Moscow in Serbo-Croatian to Yugoslavia 1700 GMT 25 Mar 83

[Text] A TASS correspondent reports from Belgrade: The state flags of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia were hoisted at Belgrade airport today. Nikolay Tikhonov was seen off by Milka Planinc, president of the Federal Executive Council; Lazar Mojsov, federal secretary for foreign affairs; and by other officials. Persons accompanying Nikolay Tikhonov left together with him for Moscow: Viktor Maltsev, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR: Nikolay Komarov, first deputy minister of foreign trade of the USSR; Vitaliy Morozov, first deputy chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations; and Nikolay Inozemtsev, deputy chairman of Gosplan.

HUNGARY'S MARJAI ARRIVES IN MOSCOW FOR VISIT

LD272244 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1630 GMT 27 Mar 83

[Text] Jozsef Marjai has arrived in Moscow. The deputy chairman of the Hungarian Government and the cochairman of the Hungarian-Soviet Economic Intergovernmental Committee, is going to have talks with Nikolay Talyzin, USSR deputy chairman, about cooperation between the two countries.

HUNGARY'S KADAR RECEIVES SHALAYEV

LD252223 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 25 Mar 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] In Budapest, Janos Kadar, first secretary of the HSWP Central Committee, received a Soviet trade union delegation headed by Comrade Shalayev, chairman of the AUCCTU, which had taken part in a meeting of the leaders of the trade union centers of European countries belonging to the WFTU. In the course of the talk, which took place in a cordial, comradely atmosphere, there was an exchange of opinions on certain problems of Soviet-Hungarian relations, on tasks of the development of cooperation between the trade unions of the Soviet Union and Hungary.

NICARAGUAN DELEGATION MAKES MOSCOW STOPOVER

Met by Bodyul, Komplektov

LD241249 Moscow TASS in English 1206 GMT 24 Mar 83

[Text] Moscow March 24 TASS -- The Nicaraguan delegation, led by Daniel Ortega, member of the National Leadership of the Sandinist National Liberation Front, coordinator of the steering council of the National Reconstruction Government, made a stop over in Moscow today on their way home. The delegation attended the seventh summit conference of Non-aligned states in New Delhi.

At the airport the delegation were met by Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Ivan Bodyul, deputy foreign minister of the USSR Viktor Komplektov, other officials.

Departs Moscow for Home

LD252132 Moscow TASS in English 2042 GMT 25 Mar 83

[Text] Moscow March 25 TASS -- The Nicaraguan delegation headed by Daniel Ortega, member of the National Leadership of the Sandinist National Liberation Front, coordinator of the ruling Junta of the National Reconstruction Government, left the Soviet capital for home today. The delegation had made a stopover in Moscow on their way from Delhi where they had taken part in the 7th Non-aligned Summit Conference.

In the airport the delegation was seen off by Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Ivan Bodyul and other Soviet officials.

UN SECURITY COUNCIL DISCUSSES NICARAGUA

LD241354 Moscow TASS in English 0831 GMT 24 Mar 83

[Text] New York March 24 TASS — TASS correspondent Valentin Vasilets reports:

Counter-revolutionary activities against Nicaragua are orchestrated by the U.S. Administration. This was stated on Wednesday at the U.N. Security Council by Deputy Foreign Minister of Nicaragua Victor Hugo Tinoco, who opened the discussion of the heightened situation in Central American, the result of aggressive sallies of counter-revolutionary gangs against Nicaragua. The U. S. Govenment, he said, which reared the venal Somoza dictatorship, now masterminds the aggression, its victim being the people of Nicaragua again. Under the direction of the United States enemies of the Nicaraguan revolution underwent military training in Texas and other areas. Subversive activities became brisker since the beginning of 1982 when the CIA took into its hands coordination of actions of counter-revolutionary groups. Those groups started military subversive actions and terror against the population of Nicaragua. The CIA gave aid to those groups in recruiting mercenaries and their training, said Nicaragua's representative.

Victor Hugo Tinoco stressed that the Somoza men, who intruded into the territory of Nicaragua, would be routed. He pointed to the danger of involvement into military actions of units of Honduras Armed Forces. On March 22 Honduras troops attacked the Santo Tomas observation post, he said.

The responsibility of the United States for the obtaining situation cannot be concealed. Nobody can deny that the U.S. Administration seeks to defeat the Sandinist revolution, and it does not disdain to use any methods in doing so, said the representative of Nicaragua. Washington's hostile attitude to the revolution from the very beginning found expression in its decision to terminate aid to Nicaragua. In U.S. attempts to block any foreign economic aid to it.

Victor Hugo Tinoco requested the Security Council that it should call upon the United States to terminate attempts to destroy the Nicaraguan revolution, to put an end to "secret but well-known war" which the Reagan administration conducts against his country.

Representative of Honduras Ortez Colindres asserted, contrary to facts, that his government does not render military aid to counter-revolutionaries, that it does not encourage them for the struggle against the revolutionary Government of Nicaragua. He justified mobilisation of Honduras Armed Forces along the frontier of Nicaragua by "the sovereign right to defence".

Gross attacks on the Government of Nicaragua were made by U.S. Ambassador at the United Nations Jeane Kirkpatrick. Her speech was actually downright interference in the affairs of the sovereign state. With imperial arrogance she tried to dictate to the Government of Nicaragua what policy it should conduct, what transformations it should strive for. Using the right to reply, Nicaragua's representative turned down the claims of the American delegate "to read lectures" to other states. Noting the hypocrisy of her "concern over the violations of human rights" in Nicaragua, he advised Jeane Kirkpatrick to cast her glance on Chile, Guatemala, and El Salvador, with their fascist regimes having favourable support of the Reagan administration.

The Security Council will continue discussing the question.

PENTAGON, CIA 'MASTERMINDED' NICARAGUA INCURSION

LD250925 Moscow TASS in English 0822 GMT 25 Mar 83

[Text] Moscow March 25 TASS -- Commenting on reports about the incursion by Somozista gangs into Nicaragua, the newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA said today: "Although designed to mislead, the U.S. Administration officials' subterfuges cannot deceive anybody: The aggressive sally by Somozista counter-revolutionary gangs into Nicaraguan territory was masterminded, prepared, and staged under the direct supervision of the C.I.A. and the Pentagon. The C.I.A. raised army units from among scattered groups of surviving Somozista guardsmen. The Pentagon supplied them with modern weapons, communications means, and helicopters. It was also American instructors that oversaw immediate preparations for the planned invasion in the secret camps in Honduran territory, where some 5,000 mercenaries were trained."

"The bandits' thrust into Nicaragua," the newspaper contended, "was a logical corollary of the so-called Caribbean initiative, which had been put forward by the White House and which is designed to camouflage Washington's true, aggressive plans in relation to the Central American and Caribbean nations." This "initiative, " KRASNAYA ZVEZDA charged further, is aimed at keeping in power the rotten dictatorial regimes in a number of these countries, perpetuating the sway of North American monopolies in their economies, putting down the popular liberation struggles in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras and elmininating the revolutionary gains of the working people of Cuba, Nicaragua, and Grenada.

"The armed provocation against Nicaragua and the sharp increases in U.S. military aid and support to the bloody Salvadoran tryanny and other unpopular dictatorships, as well as the Pentagon's provocative naval maneuvers in the Caribbean these days are links in the same chain." "But neither the incursion of heavily armed counter-revolutionary gangs, nor the NATO navies' threatening exercises, and the clamorous propaganda campaign in the United States," the paper concluded, "have been able to intimidate the courageous defenders of the Nicaraguan revolution. They give a befitting rebuff to the bandits, foiling their master's dirty plans. The heroic people of Nicaragua have on their side the wholehearted solidarity and sympathies of the progressive forces of the entire world. The world public is angrily condemning the Washington-organised act of aggression by Somozists and demanding vigorously: Hands off Nicaragua!"